

GENEALOGY COLLECTION

✓

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01741 2799

GENEALOGY

977.2

IN2471A

1920

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

CONTENTS

	Page
TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT AND LEGISLATION IN INDIANA <i>Charles E Canup</i>	3
A PIONEER WEDDING <i>Catherine Noble</i>	38
AMERICANISM 100 YEARS AGO <i>Mary Boggs</i>	45
INDIANA IN THE MEXICAN WAR (<i>Continued</i>), <i>R. C. Buley</i>	46
RECOLLECTIONS OF THE CAMPAIGN OF 1856 <i>Edwin P. Harter</i>	69

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.00 PER YEAR

SINGLE COPY, 50 CENTS

Entered as second-class matter September 16, 1913, at the postoffice at
Bloomington, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

All publications of the Indiana Historical Society are sent free to its members. Join the society.

The Indiana Magazine of History is published by the Department of History of Indiana University, with the aid of the Indiana Historical Society and the Indiana State Library. The purpose of the Magazine is to foster an interest in the history of the State, and it invites the coöperation of all persons and societies to whom this object appeals. Its editors solicit from any source the contribution of historical notes and articles dealing with Indiana history. The editors and contributors receive no pay for their services. It is the aim of the editors to make the Magazine popular in its appeal, while at the same time fostering accuracy and sound historical methods.

"Six quarterly publications devoted to history, archaeology, or genealogy are issued in the Old Northwest. The best of these from the standpoint of scientific history is the *Indiana Magazine of History* published by the Department of History of Indiana University in coöperation with the Indiana State Historical Society, and the Indiana State Library, and edited by Dr. Logan Esarey."—*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, June, 1914.

"*The Indiana Magazine of History* continues to hold the premier place among historical periodicals of the Old Northwest in editorial workmanship and qualities of papers."—*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, June, 1915.

Editor of the Indiana Magazine of History,
Bloomington, Indiana.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed find two dollars for which please send me the *Indiana Magazine of History* for one year. I also desire to become a member of the State Historical Society (for which there is no extra charge).

(Signed)

.....

680965

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COOPERATION OF

THE INDIANA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

THE INDIANA STATE LIBRARY

BOARD OF EDITORS

JAMES A. WOODBURN, PH.D., Professor of American History
and Politics, Indiana University

SAMUEL B. HARDING, PH.D.,

GEORGE S. COTTMAN, Former Editor, Madison

WILLIAM O. LYNCH, A.M., Professor of History, Indiana State
Normal School

HARLOW LINDLEY, A.M., State Archivist, Professor of History,

JACOB P. DUNN, LL.B., Secretary Indiana Historical Society

DEMARCHUS C. BROWN, A.M., State Librarian

LOGAN ESAREY, PH.D., Managing Editor

Associate Professor of Western History, Indiana University

Subscription Price, \$2.00 per year.

Single Number, 50 Cents.

Address all communications to the MANAGING EDITOR, BLOOMINGTON, IND.

Copyright, 1920, by
Indiana University

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

VOL. XVI

MARCH, 1920

No. 1

Temperance Movements and Legislation in Indiana

By Charles E. Camp, DePauw University, 1919

EARLY INDIANA METHODISM AND TEMPERANCE MOVEMENTS

The history of the temperance movement in Indiana may be divided, roughly speaking, into three great movements or cycles which seemingly have increased in their intensity until the desired result has been accomplished. The first cycle began with the early settlement of the territory and lasted until the year 1855; of course the first quarter of a century, or up until 1816, we must call merely a period of establishment. It would be hard to say that this movement began previous to the ratification of the state constitution. The second period began with the fall of the temperance forces at the close of 1855 and lasted from that time until the early part of the legislative session of 1883; this period, full of discouragements and trials for the temperance forces, culminated in their bitter disappointment at that time. From that date until 1917 they have worked more heroically than ever before. There has been more study, more organization and more devotion to the cause than in any of the previous years. Consequently this, the third period is the most important of them all. It embodies all of the experiences and lessons of the first two attempts, and with these and a greater determination to back them, the temperance forces have at last been successful.

Summarizing hastily the situation as it was in 1800, we

find some very peculiar conditions existing. Imagine a population of 4,875 people largely scattered about, for the most part, in the three enormous counties of the territory, Knox, Clark, and Wayne; bear in mind that these people were the product of other backwoods localities; that they had been denied all of the so-called refining influences of their earlier ancestry; that they were rude and unkempt; crue and uneducated; and that religion was almost unknown to them, at least, as a practical working force, and remember, also, that this was a wild frontier country which needed taming, and that it was a rough people that must do that taming. Add to this the facts that the pioneer Hoosier was essentially a good man, sturdy, true, kind, and possessing all the sterling characteristics of an embryonic citizen of a great commonwealth and you have a miniature picture of the earliest phases of civilization in Indiana.

With the coming of such men came the institutions of their old home. They brought with them old ideas of a social life, of family legends and feuds, of taverns and dances, of schools and churches. And yet, such is not strange for men roam the world over carrying with them their institutions and their industries, their strengths and their weaknesses. And as might be expected, with this early settler came the whiskey flask and memories of other and more hilarious times. It is no state secret that the majority of these early pioneer trappers, hunters and missionaries made use of the "artificial-fire" to warm themselves when it was cold and to cool themselves when it was hot. Consequently as a result of this practice and the demand which grew up out of the custom, as well as the profits derived therefrom, taverns and bar-rooms were not slow in making their appearance.

And with them came Methodism, one of the most vital temperance forces in early times. Still, it is not altogether correct to say that they came together for the liquor elements in nearly all localities seem to have ante-dated the other by some years. However, in a great many cases they did come at the same time; with the entry of more new settlers they came, hand in hand, often embodied in the same person; riding on horseback, trudging behind the pioneer train or marching in

military procession. And so both had their beginnings, we might say, simultaneously.

In 1800 William Henry Harrison was appointed governor of the territory. He took his office January 10, 1801, at Vincennes where the seat of government had been established. Here in July of 1805, the first legislature of the territory was convened. Conditions appeared to be very prosperous, yet in spite of this apparent progress the country grew very slowly. At the same time that congress separated the territory of Indiana from the Northwest territory in 1800 it had also passed a law that the territory might have a representative as soon as it could boast of a population of five thousand free white male citizens over twenty-one years of age. So slow was the growth that this did not take place until 1808. There were, perhaps, four reasons for this slow increase in population. They were as follows:

1. The Indian title to the land was extinguished only on a few tracts on the border of **Indiana and Illinois.**
2. The high price of government land. It was sold at two dollars (\$2.00) an acre.
3. The absurd manner of selling the land.¹
4. Ohio being older and more settled attracted most of the moving population.²

Sometime, too, during the year 1809 congress divided the territory into two parts, Indiana and Illinois. This was so unpopular that it "raised the danger" of a great many of the people for they had been quite anxious to become a state as soon as the required number of voters had been acquired. After the year 1810 the territory became one of the so-called first class varieties for the people were allowed to choose their representative to the national assembly.³ This continued until the state was admitted to the union in 1816. By the fall of 1815 the population of the state numbered 63,897. This being more than the congressional requirement of sixty thousand, preparations were made to hold a constitutional convention in the territory.

1. At first they sold only in sections of one mile square, later half sections, and still later, in 1804, fourth sections. The purchaser paid one-fourth in advance; another fourth in two years; another in three years; and the remainder in four years. In case of failure to pay in the required time, six percent was charged from the date of maturity. *Western Christian Advocate*, Aug. 15, 1845.

2. *Western Christian Advocate*, Aug. 15, 1845 p. 69.

3. *Western Christian Advocate*, Aug. 15, 1845 p. 69.

It was held during the summer of 1816 at Corydon; a constitution was framed and submitted to congress early in the session of the same year. This convention was composed for the most part of "clear-minded, practical men, whose patriotism was above suspicion and whose morals fair".⁴ After the constitution had been under consideration for several days in the senate of the United States they declared in favor of it on December 6. On December 9 the house followed in like manner and the constitution was formally adopted two days later. Indiana had become a state with the full rights of such a commonwealth.

Because many of the early reforms were to a large extent the outgrowth of Methodist effort it is well to give at this time a brief sketch of their work. As hinted above, the Methodists had not been idle. To begin with they did not have settlements as a body of emigrants, yet occasionally a few families of Methodists would be found contiguous to each other.⁵ However, in the broader sense, they were greatly scattered and did not have much intercourse. And in these groups of early Methodists there was seldom to be found a preacher, but it was only a few years until an occasional circuit-rider made visits to the more thickly settled parts and preached. The first sermons ever preached in Indiana were probably preached by Berry Lakin and Samuel Parker for they made transient visits to Clark's Grant, now Clark county, as early at 1801.⁶ Moses Ashworth, another Methodist, has the distinction of having the first pastoral charge. This was on the Silver Creek circuit in Clark's Grant.⁷ The first circuit to be organized was also completed by Ashworth in the year 1807. It was called the Silver Creek circuit and had one hundred and eighty-eight members at the end of the first year.⁸ Of course, in the meantime other circuits were in the process of establishment near Vincennes and in the Whitewater district in the southeastern section of the country.

4. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 19.

5. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 79.

6. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 26. Among the first Methodist Sermons ever preached in the territory were those preached by the venerable Peter Cartwright in 1804. These were preached at Robert's and Prather's with Mr. Lakin.

7. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 26.

8. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 26.

At first, meeting-houses were not erected due to the fact that the home-making work had to be done. Later, however, places of worship began to rise, the first one built was in the Robertson neighborhood, near Charlestown. By the end of the first year three meeting-houses had been erected on this circuit alone.⁹ To be sure, they were cheap, rough, log-houses, yet they showed evidences of a desire on the part of the people to express their piety and liberality. This was in 1807.

Before the erection of these meeting-houses the more or less informal srvicees had to be held in the home of some member who happened to live in the more populous district. This however, was not always suitable for the houses were small and accomodations poor. Sometimes they met in the open under the shade of enormous trees and there worshiped in primitive fashion; and then again they were offered the use of some tavern, some house of entertainment, or some bar-room. These were nearly always accepted for people looked upon drink as one of the necessities and such places were not held in bad repute. A remarkable instance has been cited.

The bar-room although saturated with whiskey and tobacco was nevertheless often the first place thrown open to preaching in a western village and the landlord would pride himself on keeping good order during the services.¹⁰

Perhaps the first sermons preached in New Albany and Rising Sun were in bar-rooms. A preacher on one of these early circuits had to pass through a village which contained a tavern. He left word that he would preach there at noon on his next round. In the meantime the tavern-keeper advertised the meeting and a large crowd was present. The preacher came at the appointed time and preached a sermon with good results. Another sermon preached under similar circumstances by James Conwell of Laurel led to the conversion of a tavern-keeper, who then disposed of his liquors and made a church out of his bar-room until the erection of a permanent building.

Tarkington in his Autobiograhay says;

The next day I went on giving out appointments for the Reverend Garner, and that night got to O'Neals place. I preached there and after

9. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 26.

10. *Western Christian Advocate*. Feb. 10, 1858.

11. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 99.

the sermon Major O'Neal said that he was going to move away and would be gone before the minister made his next round and wanted to know who of those present would open their house for the preaching. All were silent for some time and then Major David Robb arose and said, 'Rather than have no preaching in the neighborhood, I will open my house. I have a large bar-room and there are several sinners at my house. If you will accept of what I have you are welcome'. So the appointment was made and given out for the preaching at Major Robb's place near Princeton in two weeks. The Major treated the preachers well all year and though he never made profession of religion, yet all the female members of his family became religious".

In fact it was a pretty well established theory that every settlement and blockhouse was visited by these bold itinerants who did not scorn to preach in the bar-room of the taverns, in the towns, in the forts, in the block-houses, and in the groves as well as in the cabins of the early settlers.¹² Such examples of influence wielded by Methodism might be increased ad infinitum, but these will serve to show the tendency of the times.

In the meantime more and more Methodist societies came to be formed. The membership and the number of local preachers and circuits grew quite rapidly. By 1810 there were 755 Methodists in the state out of a population of 24,520- slightly more than three per cent. Besides this the doctrines and usages of the sect were fast coming to be understood and appreciated by observing friends of the church.

As time passed many of the ministers became more and more earnest in their temperance measures. Gradually those who occasionally drank quit the habit and, those who drank much began to make it occasional. In addition to this they began to urge temperance reforms upon their members. Their attitude may well be illustrated by a minister by the name of Cravens who rarely preached a sermon without making those who made, sold or drank intoxicating drinks feel uneasy.

On one of his circuits a brother was accused of unnecessarily drinking ardent spirits. He was cited to trial and found guilty. The committee was anxious to save him to the church and wished to know whether he would quit the habit of dram-drinking. After some reflection he said that he would try to quit. It was evident, however, that he did not feel any particular guilt attached to his conduct, and that the church was rather

12. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 100.

an interference with his personal rights; but rather than leave the church he would promise to try to quit; and on that promise the committee retained him. 'But' said Cravens, 'Brother, you must quit'. That was more than the brother would promise to do, so Cravens carried the case up to the next quarterly conference and the brother was required to give up his drams or his church. He concluded to give up the former and doubtless owed his salvation from a drunkard's grave to the uncompromising integrity of his pastor.¹³

It has been well said that Cravens made an impression in favor of Methodism and against intemperance that has never faded out to this day. And so it was with a great many of these early heroic souls.

But in spite of Methodist and other agitations against drinking very little was done to further the temperance cause during this pre-state period. In the very beginning of the territory, however, the governor found that the liquor traffic was troublesome and in a little more than six months after his arrival, issued a proclamation which forbade any trader to sell whiskey or other liquor to the Indians in Vincennes. If a trader sold at all he was compelled to deliver it to the buyer at least one mile from town, or on the west side of the Wabash.¹⁴

Two other early acts, passed by the territorial legislature also dealt with selling liquors to Indians. Because of the dangers caused by disposing of intoxicating beverages to the red men it was made a crime to furnish any of them with any kind of "fire-water". Breaking the law was punishable by a fine of not less than five nor more than one hundred dollars. It took effect August 15, 1805.¹⁵ During the following year another act was passed also affecting the Indian. It ordered that any trader or other person residing within forty miles of Vincennes, or who came into or passed through such territory and who sold, gave or presumed to sell or give any intoxicating liquors of any description to the aborigines should be fined upon conviction in the sum not less than five nor more than one hundred dollars. This was done to safeguard the settlement

13. Holiday, *Indiana Methodism*, 57-8-9.

14. *Executive Journal, Indiana Territory*, 102-3. The white man usually got the Indian drunk, then robbed him. In his effort to retaliate the Indiana often committed petty crime which brought him within the limits of the law.

15. *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 1805. pp 5-6.

from depredations while the red man might be in a state of intoxication.¹⁶

Later another act was passed to regulate the traffic generally. This was in 1807. It provided that before anyone could keep an inn or tavern a permission or license must be obtained from the court of common pleas. Such license was good for one year or until the next meeting of the court. Besides this, they had also to give bond in the sum of three hundred dollars to the governor, pending good behavior, strict observance of the laws and the like. A few provisions were added regarding the place of business the house must be kept orderly no drunkenness, or unlawful games being allowed¹⁷ no minors were permitted to buy or drink any liquors; and good accommodations had to be provided for both man and horse. No person unless qualified by law could sell liquor in less quantities than one quart. Adequate penalties were provided for the law breaker. In addition to this the law further proposed that the governor should issue a proclamation forbidding the sale or gift of any ardent spirits to any Indian within thirty miles of any council, treaty meeting, or conference. Violators of this act were to be fined not less than fifty dollars nor more than five hundred dollars.¹⁸ With the exception of some slight amendments to this law in 1813 no further legislation took place in the history of the territory.¹⁹

Summing up then, it cannot be said that the Methodist church had any direct influence on these temperance legislative movements. There had been influence of an indirect nature such as preaching and admonitions, but at this time even this might be said to have been slight. This is by no means intended to be derogatory to the Methodist church but rather to show that the nature of the times and conditions did not make it a crime or a sin to drink liquors. And since practically everyone thought it was perfectly all right to drink occasionally no action was likely to be taken. The public mind had not yet been awakened to the baneful influence of dram-drinking.

But after 1816 conditions in the state settled down to a slow steady growth and took on a more rosy aspect. The popula-

16. *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 1806. p 29.

17. *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 1807. pp 87-92.

18. *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 1813. pp 8-10.

tion increased steadily from 24,520 in 1810 to 147,178 in 1820 and from that to 343,031 in 1830. With this growth came the development of the institutions of government, of school systems, of social life, of religion, and of intemperance. Methodism had grown from 755 in 1810 to 4410 in 1820 and from that to 7,551 in 1830. Truly a remarkable growth. Other churches began to spring up, but no other society appeared before 1824 so the drinking customs and habits remained much the same until after that year.

Yet in spite of the comparative lack of sentiment some extension of liquor legislation relative to regulation was attempted in 1817 for during that year it was made a crime to sell any liquors on Sunday. A fine of three dollars for each offense was the penalty.¹⁹ Again in 1818 the question of regulation was up before the law-makers. The board of commissioners of each county was authorized to license at their meetings every person who applied for such license provided the applicant could produce the signatures of twelve respectable householders certifying that such person was of a good moral character, that it would be for the convenience of travelers and beneficial to the community. Moreover, the applicant was bonded in the sum of five thousand dollars not to sell on Sunday, or permit gambling, or disorderly conduct on his premises. The license was good for one year, but provided that no liquor could be sold to a minor, to apprentices, to servants, or to anyone in a state of intoxication. All fines were to go to the county seminaries. The commissioners also fixed the rate, which the tavern keeper was required to keep posted. Failure to do this or selling at a higher rate was punishable by a fine of three dollars, and a clerk's fee of twenty-five cents.²⁰

No other legislation appeared before 1820. Then it provided that should tavern-keepers fail to set up for one whole day the price list, and should charge more than the law allowed they might be fined not less than five nor more than fifty dollars.²¹

Two laws amending former acts were passed in 1824. One

19. *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 1817 p 166.

20. *Laws of Indiana*, 1817-18 Vol. II. pp 196-9.

Another act the same year provided for a fine of three dollars for the tavern keeper who sold on Sunday except to travelers. *Laws of Indiana*, 1818. p. 314.

21. *Laws of Indiana*, 1820. pp 87-88.

Another act of this year did away with gambling.

of these provided that the commissioners should look into their price lists and profits and then grade the license fee accordingly. It was to be not less than five nor more than twenty-five dollars.²² Another act provided a fine of not less than fifty nor more than two hundred dollars for allowing gambling on the premises; a fine of not less than two nor more than twenty for selling without license; a fine not less than five nor more than fifty for not posting price list from day to day; and, a fine of not more than three dollars for selling on Sunday.²³

The act of 1825 increased the number of free-holders who must sign the application for a license from twelve to twenty-four; this application had to state that the applicant was of good moral character; that it would be for the benefit of the traveling public to have such a tavern; and that it was conducive to the public good. Moreover, such applicant had to prove to the satisfaction of the board of justices that he or she was and would be a resident of the town or village for at least one year, and be the owner of at least two beds and bedding over and above that for family use. They were also by this law required to keep good stabling for at least four horses. The license cost five to twenty-five dollars in addition to which they had to give bond with freehold security.²⁴

In 1828 there was a return to the former law which required but twelve signatures. They had to give bond as required by the previous laws except as regard the bedding and stabling. It was also made possible for a majority of free-holders of any town or township to prevent the granting of a license by a remonstrance.²⁵

This summary has been sufficient to show that no attempt to eradicate the liquor traffic had been made-- only regulation had been attempted. At that, much of their time and efforts had been consumed in changing back and forth from one law to another in attempt to reduce to the lowest point depredations and suffering. And still public sentiment had hardly been aroused on the subject. Conditions were about the same as in the days when the state was a territory. With the exception of

22. *Laws of Indiana*, 1824. p 339.

23. *Laws of Indiana*, 1824, p 146.

24. *Laws of Indiana*, 1824-5. pp 406-7.

25. *Laws of Indiana*, 1828. pp 79-80.

some spasmodic attempts on the part of the Methodists and other churches practically nothing had been accomplished to enlighten the people.

PERIOD OF ENLIGHTENMENT

Due particularly to the effort of the early circuit-riders the idea of prohibition was brought into the various settlements of the state at the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. This resulted in feeble movements looking toward the formation of some total abstinence societies. The first of these appeared some time during the year 1824. It was a volunteer society whose members pledged themselves not to furnish whiskey at "raisings and log-rollings".¹ It was composed of the best class of people, most of whom seem to have been members of various churches, chief of which was the Methodist. This first society has sometimes been called the "teetotalers" or "total abstinence society."

From this the movement spread. Zealous preachers of temperance went into every part of the country and it was not long before the American Temperance Society formed.² This was in 1826. However, it is doubtful whether this movement had any great effect on the state before the year 1830. In 1828 still other parts of the state organized temperance societies, and by 1829 there was a united effort at Indianapolis which has continued in some form ever since.³

Even though these total abstinence societies had come into existence it is doubtful whether they were of much significance outside of the fact that they were forerunners of a great movement. Although no statistics are available it is quite safe to assume that the churches were the leaders in the movement. The attempts at reformation through the churches began about the time that the territory was admitted into the union and sermons against the use of liquor as a beverage increased from year to year. This proved to be the only means of enlightenment on the subject the people had. With them, too, it was strictly a moral issue not political. Later, however, it became gradually a political as well as a moral issue.

1. Wood, *Sketches and Things and People in Indiana*. 47.

2. Shadwell, *Drink, Temperance and Legislation*. 91.

3. Wood, *Sketches and Things and People in Indiana*. p. 48.

As also noted in the first chapter, a great wave of social enlightenment swept over the entire country at the beginning of the thirties. This spread of intelligence brought about everywhere a movement to reform manners. Particularly was attention directed to the misuse of spiritous liquors.⁴ And each succeeding wave of reform for the next twenty years reached higher than the preceeding one. This enlightenment took countless forms.

Along with this social regeneration came better conditions in the state. The population almost trebled between 1820 and 1830 so that at the latter date about a million people inhabited the state. Education grew by leaps and bounds; schools and colleges sprang up all over the various section of the state⁵ transportation and other means of communication increased, and churches rose as if by magic. Methodism grew from a church of 17,551 to one of 74,583 at the close of 1850-- seven percent of the entire population.⁶ While not as large as the Methodist the other denominations increased in like proportion. Naturally enough, too, the liquor traffic increased greatly.

Grog shops have been reared in almost every neighborhood, and ardent spirits as a drink have become quite fashionable among all classes.⁷

But if intemperance increased so had the agitation against it. As if in accordance with the upheaval during the thirties and forties the churches began, in their official capacity, to speak out on the subject. This time the records of the Methodist conference show a particular activity in the number of resolutions adopted and assistance offered. Preachers were admonished to speak as often and as strongly against the traffic as was deemed practicable.⁷ As an example of the scores of these resolutions adopted by the Indiana conferences we quote the following one:

Whereas the cause of temperance holds high rank among the various enterprises of moral reform which now engage the attention of the public, we believe it to be the important duty of every lover of his country, and religion, thus to render a hearty co-operation in the promotion of its

4. Bassett, *A Short History of the United States*. 480.

5. These statistics of the church were taken from the report of the Indiana M. E. Convention held in Indianapolis Oct. 18-20, 1870.

6. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1857, p. 7.

7. Strange to relate the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, the oldest and most influential organ of the Methodist church in the west, opposed teetotalism, editorially, as contradicting the acts of the Savior and the advice of Paul.

interests and in firmly securing in its behalf, the public confidence. To accomplish this object, we do not suppose it necessary now, as heretofore, to defend either the propriety of the cause or what we regard as well ascertained fact in the doctrine of temperance, namely, that total abstinence is the only effectual remedy for the evil of intemperance.*** And we regard it as the duty of every philanthropist, and specially of every Methodist, to continue his opposition, and even with more zeal to assail, and, if possible, to overthrow the guilty practice of inebriation, and all the forms of temptation which are constantly before our citizens, particularly the youth, and such reformed inebriates as has been sought out and re-deemed from their brothels and coffee-house associations. ***

That we may render timely aid in this work, we invite your attention to the subject of memorializing the convention now in session in Indiana for the purpose of amending the constitution of the state, and that we, in connection with other petitioners, most respectfully urge upon them the propriety of forbidding the granting of license by future legislation.*** We would, therefore, submit for your consideration and adoption the following resolutions:

1 Resolved: that as a conference, we continue to have unabated confidence in the rules of our Disciples in reference to the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating drinks, and that we cordially approbate the ministerial fidelity which has ordinarily characterized the administration of our Discipline, on this subject, within the bounds of the conference.

2. Resolved: That we regard the church of God as the most hopeful instrument of moral reform: and to it mainly are we to look for success in our opposition to the great evil of intemperance.

3. Resolved: That so far as is consistent with our pastoral duties and Gospel vocations, we will co-operate with the various temperance organizations in promoting the cause of temperance. Yet we do not, and will not, countenance any agent or lecturer on the subject whose habit it is to denounce the church or its ministers as opposed to the cause of temperance, or who in their public addresses, indulge in ribaldry, obscene jests, or slanderous misrepresentations***things totally unbecoming our pulpits, and ruinous subversive to Christian dignity and the sacredness of God's house.

4. Resolved: That we will memorialize the state convention now in session, to prohibit in the new Constitution the licenseing of tippling houses.⁸

Thomas H. Rucker

G. W. Walker

Thomas A. Goodwin. Committee.

After 1840 a great many temperance societies began to be formed. A new society known as the Washingtonians was organized in 1841. It had been formed in Washington some time

8. *Indiana Conference Minutes*, 1850. pp. 21-2.

during the winter by a few drunkards, who, at the debauch one night signed the following pledge:

We, whose names are annexed, are desirous of forming a society for our mutual benefit and to guard against a practice, a pernicious practice, which is injurious to health, standing, and families, do pledge ourselves as gentlemen, that we will not drink any spirit or malt liquor, wine or cider.

Signed,

W. K. Mitchell, Tailor.

J. F. Hoss, Carpenter.

James McCurley, Coachmaker

David Anderson, Blacksmith.

George Steers, Blacksmith.

Archibald Campbell, Silversmith.⁹

From this meagre beginning it spread rapidly until it reached its height. Songs and poems were printed and sung by the hundreds.¹⁰ Thousands of people joined the society in less than a year. But the high tide did not last long for it began to subside in 1842 and had entirely spent its force by 1843.

So numerous were these songs that it is well to give one here.

WASHINGTONIAN SONG

(Composed for the society at Parkersburg, Indiana)

Some sing the praise of rosy wine
Its sparkling color bright;
But in such songs with them to join,
We cannot take delight.
We have a rich and noble theme,
Fit for a Prince or King
'Tis water, pure, and fresh, and good
From Parker's village spring.

This will give health, and joy, and peace,
Refreshing every power;
We want no better drink than this,
In trial's darkest hour.
To cheer the heart and quench the thirst,
It is the very thing;
Then give us water pure and good,
From Parker's village spring.

9. *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*. 649.

10. Temperance Society at Greencastle, 1842. p. 29.

The natives from this living spring,
Drank many years ago;
And from this fountain water clear,
Continues still to flow.
Then we on this our festal day,
Will of its virtue sing
And drink this water pure and good
From Parker's village spring.

January 8, 1843. J. Hosteller.

But as this movement died away another rose into prominence. The Sons of Temperance, organized in 1842, became for the next decade the conservator of temperance work in Indiana. The first division was not organized within the state until November 15, 1845. This took place at Brookville." It had three objects in view, but the temperance issue was emphasized more strongly than the others. They were as follows:

1. To shield themselves from the evils of intemperance.
2. To afford mutual assistance in case of sickness.
3. To elevate their character as men.¹¹

It enrolled people of all ages, sex, color, wealth and poverty; and while classed as a secret temperance society it had no mystic features such as the handshake, sign or degree. However, a ritual service was given and dues were charged the members. Its influence was catching and soon men went into the order by the thousands. It found friends and advocates in the most cultured circles. Leading lawyers, doctors, merchants, preachers and even politicians were found working side by side in it. As a result it grew from the meagre beginning of one chapter in 1845 to 171 divisions in 1848, 232 by the middle of 1849, 283 by the end of the same year and more than 370 by the close of 1850.¹² In their ninth annual report twenty-three propositions were presented concerning the amount of knowledge disseminated by their conventions, societies, ecclesiastical orders, and the like. The last proposition dealt especially with the

11. *Minutes and Proceedings of the State Temperance Convention*. 1-16.

12. *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*. 611-2.

13. The Preamble of Constitutions of Sons of Temperance of Madison: "We, whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a society to shield us from the evils of intemperance, afford mutual assistance in case of sickness, and elevate our characters as men—do pledge ourselves to be governed by the following constitution and By-laws." Pledge follows: "No brother shall make, buy, sell or use as a beverage, any spirituous, or malt liquors, wies or ciders. Age over 18. Fee \$3. Black ball system of election." *Constitution and By-laws of Madison Division, Number 8*. pp. 1-16.

attitude of the church toward the movement and read as follows:

Especially it is wrong for professed christian to thus use, make or furnish liquor; more especially still, for officers of the church, and ministers of the gospel—as the better the character and the greater the influence of those who pursue a wrong practice, the more extensively will it be initiated, the longer it will be continued, and the greater the mischief it will be likely to do.¹⁴

Later, in 1854, they raised \$11,490, to which ninety counties contributed, for a thorough organization of the state. This appears to be the first time that any considerable sum of money was raised to combat the evil.¹⁵

The official publication of the organization was the *Family Visitor*, a weekly newspaper published in Indianapolis and edited by B. F. Cavanaugh. It began sometime during the month of June 1848 and continued for several years. It contained temperance arguments, minutes of meetings, advertisements, parodies on poems, etc.¹⁶

A sort of sister organization to the Sons of Temperance was the order of the Daughters of Temperance. They were organized in 1848 and had their first annual session at Indianapolis, October 17, 1849. They did some very earnest and efficient work.¹⁷

The Cadets of Temperance, a junior temperance society, was organized at the same time as the Sons of Temperance. It was open to the members of either sex between the ages of twelve and twenty-one. One of the requirements for membership was good character, in addition to which they were obliged to take an obligation not to drink liquors as a beverage. Later the movement spread over a great many states and gained considerable momentum in Indiana.¹⁸

14. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1858.

15. *Minutes and Proceedings of the State Temperance Convention*, 1-16.

16. *Family Visitor*, 1848-51.

"Our poick says:

Of all the kings he ever knew

From old King Cole to poor lean Thin-King;

The hardest king of all to serve,

And most tyrannical is Drin-King." *Family Visitor*, June 10, 1850.

17. *Family Visitor*, Oct. 4, 1849.

18. *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*, 60.

A banner the Cadets carried read as follows:

"Cadets of Temperance we will dare

To climb the steepes of fame, and share

A nation's love, a priceless gem,

Who wins it wants no diadem." *Family Visitor*. July 12, 1848.

Sometime during the year of 1845 a small body of the Sons of Temperance organized a society within their own organization and called themselves the Templars of Honor and Temperance. It broke away from the older organization in 1849, becoming from that time on a distinct and separate society. Not a great deal is heard of them so it is doubtful whether they had much influence on the temperance situation in the state.

Before the end of this year 1855 the Order of Good Templars, another temperance organization had found its way to Indiana. This society was much the same as the others. Their pledge read:

No member shall make, buy, sell, use, furnish, or cause to be furnished to others as a beverage, any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider; and, every member shall discountenance the sale and use thereof in the proper ways.¹⁹

While the order did powerful work at a period somewhat later, it did not add much to the general agitation for temperance in this first great movement.

With the coming of this new enlightenment churches, lodges and temperance societies all vied with each other to see which could accomplish the greatest amount of good along that particular line. As has been noted before the Methodists were particularly active during the later forties. Temperance resolutions by the thousands were adopted and as a result a great amount of liquor legislation was passed. This church legislation reflected back upon the people and caused them to agitate in the legislative halls for reforms. Petitions were sent to the Assembly by the thousands. And since practically all of our legislation comes as a result of the expressed will of the people we might expect, then, some action on the subject. Such was the case.

The period of legislation between 1830 and 1850 may be characterized as the period of local legislation. Between these dates, inclusive, there were 126 legislative acts passed. A hasty summary of these will suffice to show what was done. The acts of 1831 provide that there must be a town license issued in addition to a county license. Moreover, It provided that all

19. *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*, 241

taverns must keep a price list posted in a prominent place. Failure to do this made them liable to a fine of five to fifty dollars. Besides this, nothing less than a quart might be lawfully sold without a license.²⁰ Penalties of from two to fifty dollars provided for the evasion of the latter. In the law of 1832 there was a return to the clause which required the person applying for a license to produce the certificate of twenty-four respectable free-holders, inhabitants of that town or township, and certifying that the applicant had a good moral character. In addition to this he must have a good house with two beds besides those for the family use, a stable with four good stalls and bond himself that he would allow no gambling on the premises. Groceries might be licensed in a manner similar to the tavern. Other minor clauses were included but they were of no real consequence except the one that provided that the cost of the license should be between ten and twenty-five dollars according to the size of the place.²¹ A local act was also passed which made it lawful to sell liquor in less quantities than a quart in New Albany.²² Three more such acts in 1834 affected Richmond, Centerville and Lafayette in a like manner.²³ One in 1835 allowed no one to sell liquor in less quantities than a quart in the town of Newport without having a license for one year which cost between five and twenty-five dollars according to the discretion of the town corporation. Penalty for failure to abide by this was a fine of five to fifty dollars.²⁴ In 1836 eleven such acts were passed affecting the towns and cities of Michigan City, New York, New Albany, and Evansville. They were in substance much the same as the one given in

20. *Laws of Indiana*, 1831, pp. 192-3.

No gambling was permitted in the taverns on pain of fine of two to five hundred dollars and forfeiture of license for one year.

21. *Laws of Indiana*, 1832, pp. 259-62.

22. *Laws of Indiana*, 1832, pp. 141-2.

23. *Laws of Indiana*, 1834, pp. 125, 140 and 145. Respectively.

"It shall be unlawful for any person or persons within the bounds of the corporation (of Centerville) to sell by less quantity than one quart, except for the use of the sick, any spirituous liquors, foreign or domestic, or keep what is commonly called tippling house, unless such person or persons shall, in addition to a license obtained from the county board of commissioners, or the board doing county business, obtain a license from the corporation, who is hereby authorized to grant the same for one year or less, at one time, on his, or her, or their paying into the treasury of the corporation, a sum not less than three nor more than fifty dollars at the discretion of the president and trustees of said town." Penalty for infraction of this law was not less than five nor more than fifty dollars.

Acts, 1834, p.

24. *Laws of Indiana*, 1834-4, p. 137.

the footnote below.²⁵ In 1837 nine more were added to the these; on providing for a taxation of the license of not more than one hundred dollars and not less than ten;²⁶ and, the other eight effecting the towns of Bloomfield, Knightstown, Cleveland, Shelbyville, Greensburg, Bethlehem, Greenfield, and the city of Lafayette.²⁷

And so it runs. In 1838 there were twenty such local laws;²⁸ in 1839, eleven;²⁹ in 1840, five;³⁰ and, in 1841, six.³¹ One of these acts declared it to be a nuisance to keep a tavern in a disorderly manner. The penalty was a fine of twenty-five to one hundred dollars. Still another act the same year raised the price of the license to sell no less than twenty-five nor more than two hundred dollars according to the size of the place.³² In 1842 two such acts were passed in extension of the one the year previous. One of these affected Marion county and the other the counties of Carrol and Cass.³³ The year 1843 brought three more into existence;³⁴ and, between the years 1844 and 1846 ten more such acts made their advent.³⁵ Such was the period of local legislation, which did not end, however, entirely until after the constitutional convention of 1850 and the formal adoption of the document framed at that time.

In 1847, however, at one stroke a general law was passed providing that if a majority of all the voters in the township should vote no-license then there would be none for that year.

25. *Local Law of Indiana*, 1836, pp. 13, 30, 37, 46, 52, 59, 66, 68, 74, 81, 88.

26. *Laws of Indiana*, 1836-7, p. 110.

27. *Local Laws of Indiana*, 1837, pp. 25, 45, 86, 87, 100, 105, 143, 218.
(The page references are not given in the respective order in which they occur.)

28. *Local Laws*, 1838, pp. 33, 43, 50, 58, 62, 76, 82, 88, 98, 104, 106, 110, 116, 127, 129, 130, 277, 381.

Also *Laws of Indiana 1838*, p. 592.

"Be it further enacted that no person shall sell or vend any spiritous liquors (regular licensed tavern keepers excepted), malt or fermented liquors in said corporation by retail, that is to say, by less quantity than a quart at a time without a license from the board of trustees, under the penalty of ten dollars for every offense, to be recovered in the name of the president and the trustees of the town of Jeffersonville, before any Justice of the Peace in said corporation." *Local Laws, 1838, Chap. XX, Sect. 5*, p. 129.

29. *Local Laws, 1839*, pp. 16, 37, 41, 49, 84, 109, 126, 171 339.

One act of 1839 was a state wide law and provided that each license to sell spiritous liquors should cost from twenty-five to one hundred dollars.

30. *Local Laws, 1840*, pp. 25, 40, 56, 67, 76.

31. *Local Laws, 1840*, pp. 38, 83, 97, 115.

32. *Local Laws 1840*, pp. 166, 40-42.

33. *Local Laws, 1842*, p. 127; *Acts of 1842*, p. 156.

34. *Acts of 1843*, pp. 100, 106; *Revised Statutes of 1843*, pp. 235, 392.

35. *Acts of 1844*, pp. 69, 92, 109; *Local Laws of 1843*, p. 50.

Local Laws of 1845, pp. 70, 132.

Local Laws of 1846, pp. 98, 103, 245, 269.

In addition to this eleven local acts were passed which read much the same as the years previous.³⁶ But this did not solve the problem although it was somewhat of a concession to the temperance forces. It still recognized the right to keep a tippeling house as a natural and inherent one. These were helpful movements, though, and higher and higher rose the sentiment in favor of more stringent legislation. An amendment to the constitution was even mentioned quite seriously. The church temperance workers aided by the moral forces of all kinds appeared to be headed toward certain victory so great had grown public opinion in that direction. The legislation of the years from 1848 to 1852 inclusive need not be mentioned in detail here for it was practically the same in nature as that of the few years preceding.³⁷ The next year, however, produced legislation of a far deeper significance.

The law of 1835 was a composite of all of the best features of the local, county and town laws of the past decade. Local option in a better form than at any time previous was the added characteristic. The township was made the unit and only those votes might be counted that were cast for or against the license; no provision was made for a majority of all the votes in the township. As before, proper bond had to be given; an orderly house had to be maintained; and, intoxication was forbidden. No municipal corporation could receive money for a license; and, adequate penalties were provided for anyone who broke the law.³⁸ But such a law seemed to be too much in advance of public opinion and it fell. No doubt the cause of its fall was the local option clause which had been added on this occasion. It was during this year, too, that the church people succeeded in getting a law passed to prevent the retailing or selling of liquor near any of their meeting places.³⁹

36. *Local Laws of 1847*, p.. 3, 46, 101, 191, 194, 214, 350, 372, 382, 401, 413.

37. Forty-nine acts both local and state passed during these years.

Local Laws of 1848, p.. 92, 279, 281, 409, 476, 534, 586.

Local Laws of 1849, pp. 83, 84, 85, 164, 194.

Acts of 1849, pp. 82, 373.

Local Laws of 1850, p. 218.

Acts of 1850, pp. 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130.

38. *Laws of Indiana, 1853*, p. 87.

39. "If any person shall erect, bring, keep, continue, or maintain any booth, tent, wagon, huckster, shop, or other place for sale of intoxicating liquors, cider, beer, or other drinks, or for the sale of any other article whatever; or shall sell or give away any intoxicating liquors, or shall sell any cider, beer, or other drink or any other article whatever, within two miles of any collection of any inhabitants of the state, met together for worship, or shall in any manner molest them shall be fined not more than fifty nor than less than five dollars. *Acts of 1853*, p. 90.

We pass now to a consideration of the most important single event of the first period. In order to understand it some of the agitation, especially in the political world should be noted. First during the campaign of 1854 came the famous "Hatchet Crusade" with its influence. Fifty women headed by a resolute girl went forth at Winchester and destroyed several saloons. Similar "appeals" were made at Cambridge City. At Centerville the ladies became tired of the liquor traffic and bought up all the liquor of the grog sellers and destroyed it--having first obtained a pledge from them that they would never sell any more liquid poison. The ladies paid one hundred and forty dollars for the liquor which they destroyed.⁴⁰ But besides such entreaties as these, conventions and meetings were held all over the state in the interest of the anti-liquor forces. The Dearborn county quarterly temperance meeting held at Auora was characterized by the true spirit. It expressed the sentiment that they would not cease to speak, work and vote in favor of the proposed prohibitory law until it "adorns the statue books and blessed the state."⁴¹ It seems that the tide of public sentiment in favor of a prohibitory law was setting in strongly. Speakers of talent, various organs of the press, ministers of the gospel, the aching hearts of hundreds of women all spoke with eloquent and pleading message in behalf of this reform movement.

Finally after an immense amount of organization and work, and of "stump-speaking" the convention was held.⁴² After the nominations were made it was found that the results were entirely satisfactory and acceptable to the temperance people; and, with one or more representative temperance men on the ticket, it adopted the following policy;

Resolved: That we are in favor of a judicial, constitutional and effective prohibitory law.⁴³

During the campaign that followed the preachers of all denominations united their efforts in the great work; and, not nearly all their labors were confined to the pulpit. In hundreds of places it was by the direct solicitation of the politicians that

40. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1855 p. 61.

41. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1854. p. 3.

42. *The Temperance Spontoon* was an early publication by the Rev. T. A. Goodwin, of Brookville, Indiana.

43. Goodwin, *Liquor Laws*, 12.

they addressed large political gatherings. At such meetings and conventions they constantly referred to the iniquity of whiskey drinking. Nor only this, the ministers of all denominations used every exertion to prejudice their members against the Democratic party, which had early lined up on the side of the liquor elements.

The day of the election came at last. Out of the hundred representatives elected fifty-six of them had already pledged themselves to support the prohibition measures; and, fourteen of the twenty-five senators were also pledged to the same cause. The Indianapolis *Sentinel* speaking of the election said:

We had to fight the church, the flesh, and the devil; the church in the temperance question; the flesh in the Old Whigs and the Devil in the Know-Nothings.

With such a body of men pledged to support a prohibition measure and countless petitions being received daily there could be only one result." Consequently, when the Assembly convened early in the year of 1855 it passed a law which read:

No person or persons shall manufacture, keep for sale, or sell by himself, or agent, directly or indirectly, any spirituous or intoxicating liquors.⁴⁵

44. An extract taken from the speech of Governor Wright delivered at the opening of the legislative assembly in this year gives a very clear idea of the attitude of the people of the state at this time. It was as follows:

"No one can doubt that there is a strong public sentiment in Indiana in favor of a change of our laws upon this subject (temperance); and it is the duty of the peoples' servants to carry out that sentiment. It will give me pleasure to co-operate with the representatives of the people in the adoption of any constitutional measure that may be calculated to remove this acknowledged evil from the state."

From the Speech of Governor Wright taken from the Greencastle *Banner*, January 17, 1855.

Petitions were received in great numbers daily. The *Locomotive*, February 15, 1855.

45. *Acts of 1855*, pp. 209-223.

The vote on the prohibitory lay of 1855 was as follows:

Senate Vote, *Affirmative*:

Anthony, Barnett, Bearss, Burke, Chapman, Combs, Cravens, Crnace, Crouse, Cutshaw, Ensey, Freeland, Griggs, Harris, Hawthorn, Helm, Hendry, Hosbrook, Jackson of Madison, Jackson of Tipton, Knightly, Meeker, Parker, Richardson of St. Joseph, Robinson, Rugg, Sage, Shields, Shook, Suit, Vendevanter, Weston, Williams, Wilson and Woohs. Total 34.

Negative:

Alexander, Brown, Drew, Glazebrook, McCleary, Mansfield, Mathes, Richardson of Spencer, Slater, Spann, Tarkington. Total 11. *Senate Journal*, 1855, p. 688.

House Vote, *Affirmative*:

Beach, Clark of Rush, Clark of Steuben, Clark of Tippecanoe, Bonner, Branham, Brazelton, Buchannan, Burnett, Cain, Clark of Union, Coen, Dickerson, Dunn, Earl, Ellis, Fouts, Frazer, Fifferd, Gilham, Guinn, Hadsell, Hall of Laporte, Hall of Warren, Harryman, Hervey, Hillyer, Hudson, Landers, McConnell, McCord, McMurry, Malick, Meredith, Merrifield, Monks, Murrey, Newcomb, Peckenpough, Reden, Sanford, Sims, Test, Thomas, Todd, Trusler, Turner, Wilson and Mr. Speaker. Total 54.

Negative:

Alden, Buskirk, Carnahan, Clark of Jasper, Cotton, Crozier, Gordon, Hargrove, Hester, Humphreys, Hunt, Jeter, King of Johnson, King of Madison, Lemmon, Lowe, McFarland, Miller, Montgomery, Peyton, Shull, Sturgis, Usry, Walpole and Wheeler. Total 25. *House Journal*, 1855, p. 695.

Credit for perparing and drafting the temperance law as it passed the legislature was due to Representative H. C. Newcombe. The *Locomotive*, February 15, 1855.

Exception was made for medicinal, chemical, mechanical and sacramental purposes; neither did it prohibit people from making and selling cider, wines, etc., in quantities of three or more gallons; nor was the sale of intoxicants by importers to be prohibited, providing proof could be established that it had been imported. In addition to this the county commissioners might authorize persons to manufacture and sell providing they gave proper bond to observe all laws and regulations. Many other clauses were also incorporated but these are sufficient to understand the nature of the law. It took effect on June 12, 1855; and, it had hardly begun to operate before it was an assured success. For one hundred and forty-eight days it worked, and worked so admirably that every moral man of the day pronounced it a complete success. Even the liquor men admitted it while they made preparations for its destruction.

Then came the fall. On July 2 Rhoderick Beebe, a tony saloon-keeper of Indianapolis, openly made and sold beer in his place of business. He was immediately arrested and fined fifty dollars. This, however, he refused to pay and as a consequence was sent to jail from which he shortly obtained a writ of habeas corpus. The county court upheld the law and an appeal was made to the supreme court of the state. Before the case really came to the court the attorney for the state asked for more time to prepare his arguments. As a result the court was adjourned and the case held over until the November term. But the liquor forces were anxious. Through them it had been discovered that Judge Perkins of the supreme court was opposed to the law. And on August 23 he called on his colleagues to meet in the chambers of the court-room to decide the case. The other judges, particularly Gookins and Stuart refused to come, for Perkins had no right to make such a call. In this manner things dragged on until November 8 when a boy in a saloon, by the name of Herman, openly violated the law. He was taken before the mayor and fined, but refusing to pay he was sent to jail. He was hardly in before Judge Perkins issued a writ of habeas corpus in his behalf. Later when he was brought before the same judge for trial, the attorney for the defense proposed to submit the case on the same argument that had been prepared for the Beebe case, and the attorney for the state consented.

This practically ended the case, for the judge, after a lengthy discourse on the relative merits of the law and the repetition of a few of his own previously spoken arguments against the law, concluded by saying, "The law is void, let the prisoner be discharged." It was this decision that opened the doors of the saloons now for five months closed. Judge Davison concurred in the opinion; Judge Stewart held, that Beebe was convicted rightly for selling, but should the record and returns be inadequate or defective the decision for that reason only should be reversed; and Judge Gookins held that so far as the case before the court brought different parts of the law up for consideration, it was constitutional and the judgment of the court of common pleas ought to be confirmed. Such was the decision that was handed down, and on this the law was declared unconstitutional.⁴⁶

The results have been far reaching in their extent. In the first place the outcome of the case was telegraphed "to the boys" immediately. It was two o'clock when the decision was made, yet before four the news had reached every town on any telegraph line in the state. Then followed the jubilee. The night after would be better not described. It has been said, however, that there were more drunks in Indiana five hours after the decision than there had been during the entire five months of the existence of the prohibition law; murders were committed; outrages perpetrated and depredations of all kinds abounded. The liquor forces had triumphed.

In the second place there was a sad looking crowd in the camp of the defeated. From the hopeful, buoyant and warlike conventions of the past two years it had now degenerated into a group of beaten, disheartened and demoralized men. They were now in much the same position from the standpoint of legislation as they had been in the early thirties. Their fondest hopes had been dashed aside, their spirit all but broken² their organizations in vain; the work of a quarter of a century ruthlessly overthrown by the adverse power of a single individual, and their dreams of an Utopian commonwealth dissipated. And so, disappointed and disheartened, these heroic workers again took up the burden thrown upon

46. *Beebe vs The State*, Marion C C P., November Term, 1855-6 *Indiana Reports*, 501.

them by a thoughtless and unfeeling advocate of the liquor dealers. But in spite of all these great misfortunes they were able to keep alive that little spark of divine inspiration that was later destined to enlighten practically the whole world. Things might hinder them for the time being yet in the future they could go forth to battle again.

CIVIL WAR PERIOD

The chapter that follows is a complicated one; and as a result of the disastrous defeat of the temperance forces at the hands of one man, in many respects a sad one. After the annulment of the law of 1855 only a fragment of the law of 1853 remained in force, and under the conditions it could hardly be effective. In fact so worthless did it become that it was declared void during the session of the legislature of 1859; and not the slightest difference in the amount or nature of the liquor traffic was noticeable. From 1856 to 1859 was in reality a three years reign of "booze". Add to that everything that the term implies; the arrogance of the whiskey power; and the corresponding depression of the temperance men and one is able to get an insight into the situation as it was a short time before the outbreak of the great war.

As was natural, after the victory of the temperance forces in 1855, there was a great falling off in their work---for had not the desired result been accomplished? There did not seem to be, on the face of it, any necessity for the maintenance of any further temperance organizations. As a result of this idea which grew up during the five months that the law worked, practically all of the temperance societies had been discontinued; and about the only institutions that remained to fight the liquor traffic for several years after that were the different orders, degrees and churches. Among these was the Methodist church. Like the others she had labored in the great cause, but unlike the others she still continued to labor for the enlightenment of the people along this particular line. Her ministers and members had administered the pledge of the American Temperance Society to thousands upon thousands. In addition to this thousands of Methodists were united

with the various lodges and temples in the state.¹ And after the fall of the temperance forces in 1855 the members of this sect were particularly admonished not to cease in their efforts, for now it was doubly important since there were no temperance societies in active working order, and since there were other great and weighty problems confronting the nation.²

Shortly after the decision of Judge Perkins the Democrats of the state met in their convention and adopted the same old resolution of bitter enmity toward any temperance legislation. Toward entire prohibition they were conspicuously hostile. In the meantime, the Republicans, too, had met but they adopted without hesitation and with almost unanimous voice a prohibitory resolution in almost the same words as that of 1854. However, after adopting it as a part of their platform they promptly forgot all about it, for during the campaign that followed it was not mentioned once. No preachers were invited to make political speeches as in 1854; no prohibition votes were swung from the Democratic party; and temperance became a side issue in politics. The measure had in reality ceased to be an issue in politics although the churches failed to recognize for many years to come that such was the case. As a result of the return of the former Democrats to their party and the weariness of thousands who grew tired of the conflict as soon as they saw that it meant many years of struggle before its culmination, the Republicans lost their prestige and the Democrats carried the state by a majority of eight thousand one hundred ninety-one.³ With the return of the Democrats came a tendency toward "open shop."

Bleeding Kansas and the Dred Scott Case; the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and State Rights; Lincoln's election and the abolitionists fiery utterances all in turn became the chief topics of conversation from day to day. As on-rushing clouds of smoke in the west announce the approach of a forest fire so did these happenings herald the approach of the Civil War. People became absorbed in the slavery question; in the State Rights arguments; and in equally momentous affairs of state. Their whole attention was presumably focused on the great

1. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1857, p. 165.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Goodwin, *Liquor Laws*, 23.

catastrophe which apparently loomed up before them. And so the time glided by without much mention of the temperance question.

Then came the war. Can there be anything more all-absorbing than the preparations that followed; anything more likely to claim and hold the interest of every individual⁴ or anything more nerve-racking than the war itself? The news of a battle provoked bystanders to applause; mothers to despair; and critics to abuse. News of a northern victory exalted the multitudes of the north and depressed the south. It was the center of interest, the acme of life, and the goal toward which all eyes involuntarily turned. Add to this the fact that a large per cent of the men were at the front; that all of the availbale money was spent for their equipment⁵ and that nearly all of the women were absorbed body and soul in caring for their sons, brothers, husbands, fathers and sweethearts and one may get an idea of the many channels into which flowed the public attention of the people of the north. Need it be necessary then to say that all of the energies of the legislators and other government officials were directed toward this one end---the winning of the war? And Indiana was one of the foremost in this respect; hence it is only natural to understand that she was busy elsewhere. And so the temperance question was practically abandoned for about a decade.

Ample evidence is not lacking to substantiate the above remarks. Hundreds of statements in the newspapers and periodicals of that day all testify to the truth of the assertion. One of these remarks as follows:

For some time I have observed a most fearful increase of drunkenness within the range of my travel. While I am compelled to witness this alarming fact, another, hardly less indicative of a retrograde movement, is that the religious press of the country has to a great extent closed its mouth on the growing vice of intemperance.⁴

Another publication of the time says:

It cannot be concealed that in Indiana as in other states the cause of temperance has been held in abeyance for several years by the more exciting interests of the war. The ten thousand of houses of dissipation which are everywhere slaying at home more than disease and battle combined are slaying in the army, cannot be denied.⁵

4. *Christian Advocate and Journal*, 1863, p. 10.

5. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1864, p. 363.

As if in extension of this argument another article has this to say of the situation:

The greatest evil of today is the rise of intoxicating liquor as a beverage. This has already shown itself in the army. As soldiers are more profuse in their profanity than when at home so they are more easily whirled away in their use of the dram cup. The unnatural life they lead; its exposure by night and by day to the elements and to the enemy subject them to such a test as no ordinary life would. This army usage has re-acted upon the greater army at home. Our youths have imitated their vices quite as much as their virtues. The barriers against this have been broken down. In our zeal to rebuild the union we have been careless of the undermining of society by its most active enemy.⁶

Further proof is furnished by E. E. Griswold, a temperance worker, who says:

It is much to be feared that the temperance cause has within the last few years lost ground, whether, if this fear be well grounded, the fact is due to unwise measures on the part of the advocates and the supporters, or to the recent excitements and upheavals of society, the writer will not undertake to determine. He strongly suspects that the retirement from the advocacy of the ministers of religion leaving it in the hands of buffoons, and hireling agents has had much to do with the result.⁷

In the meantime the state had continued to grow. By 1860 the population had reached the mark of 1,350,428.⁸ Social and economic conditions had gradually grown better; from an insignificant state of little worth a few decades previous it had sprung into great national prominence; schools were a great deal better, in fact a system had been fairly well established; colleges and universities had made their permanent appearance in almost every section of the state; the liquor traffic in a more pronounced form than ever was still present; and free whiskey was one of the novelties in almost every town and village in the state. And, almost, but not quite, keeping pace with the growth of these various institutions were the churches. At this time there were eight principal protestant denominations, chief among which were the Methodists. In 1860 they boasted of a membership of 96,965 as compared with 74,583 for 1850. This was a percentage of seven and one-tenth of the whole population. By 1870, in

6. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1865, p. 66.

7. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1865, p. 66.

spite of the war, the population of the state had grown to 1,668,000 and Methodism to a membership of 113,800 or a percentage of six and four-fifths. The total number of all of the other protestant membership has been estimated closely at 117,500. This gives us some idea of the importance, in size at least, of the Methodist church.⁸

Slight mention had been made of temperance since 1856 but in 1861 the Committee on Temperance of the Methodist conferences reported that the country was literally filled with drunkenness and intemperance; and urged that the church should not relax its efforts in that direction. At the same time a resolution was offered as follows:

Resolved: That we will earnestly and faithfully warn our people against the evil.

Resolved: That the selling of corn, barley, or the aiding in the manufacturing, or marketing of intoxicating liquors, or renting property to be used in the traffic is aiding and abetting the cause of intemperance.

Resolved: That we respectfully ask our editors to speak out more frequently on the subject of temperance and urge greater efforts on the subject.

Later the Rev. T. A. Goodwin, ardent champion of the temperance cause says:

I have been requested to prepare a form of a petition to the General Assembly of Indiana.

It read:

To the General Assembly of Indiana: The subscribers, citizens of Indiana, would respectfully call your attention to the ravages of intemperance in our midst growing out of the legalized tippling houses and we would respectfully and earnestly ask you to enact a law which shall wholly suppress places of public drinking.

As a result of these and similar agitations feeble movements began to be felt in the temperance world again. Some of the old societies, headed by the most ardent church workers, revived in a measure² while in other places new societies began to be organized to supplement the old. After the close of the war many of the leading temperance men of the state met in Indianapolis and organized one of these new societies

8. Report of Indiana State Methodist Convention, 40.

which was to co-operate with the others. For their name they chose "The Temperance Host of Indiana," and for their obligation they took the following:

We solemnly promise before God and man to maintain true faith and allegiance to the temperance cause, to war unceasingly against all its enemies and opposers, to abstain wholly from the traffic and use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage; to not furnish them to our social guests, nor be social guests when they are furnished; to not traffic with those who so traffic with them, nor to lend our influence in any way to those who favor traffic. We furthermore promptly promise to obey our superiors in all things appertaining to the temperance war and to hold as strictly private every transaction of the camp.¹²

Small as were these beginnings they did not fail to exercise the proper influence throughout the state. All of the old societies became more and more active; the churches began to take increased interest in the old problem; preachers, urged on by the courageous Thomas A. Goodwin became zealous in the cause; even all church members talked prohibition. It was not long before this increased sentiment began to bear fruit and by 1866 had begun to claim a large share of public attention throughout the state. About this time as well as later, the various temperance societies began to work more zealously and more effectively than ever. Among these were the Sons of Temperance, The Good Templars, and The Hosts. The State Central Committee also began operation at this time. It was heartily endorsed by the different temperance orders and enthusiastically received by all people who desired to overcome the traffic. They met in November of the year 1866 in Indianapolis and adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved: That in the opinion of the convention the time has come for giving special attention to the cause of temperance in its various branches.

Resolved: That we regard the organization of some temperance associations in very town and village as a matter of fact important for the moral influence of such associations upon the restraining of sober men and the reforming of drunkards and the creation of a healthy public sentiment.

Resolved: That we regard Juvenile Temperance organizations as a matter of great importance and we urge their formation everywhere.

Resolved: That the time has come for demanding suitable legislation on the subject of temperance.

Resolved: That we take no backward step in our demands on the subject of temperance legislation, but we adhere to the temperance platform upon which we so successfully fought twelve or fifteen years ago—absolute prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage.

Resolved: That all temperance organizations be requested to circulate for signature, petitions to our next legislature as is contemplated by the fifth resolution and that measures be adopted which will insure thorough circulation of the same in every school district of the state.

Resolved: That we as temperance men of Indiana pledge ourselves not to support in our nominating conventions, any candidate for any office who is not a practical temperance man, nor will we support at the ballot box—all things else being equal—any candidate who cannot show a clear temperance record.¹³

Although this convention was not a great success due to the small numbers present it was indicative of a further movement in behalf of the forces of right. Again in the following year they met in greater numbers, in fact, every temperance society in the state had been invited to send a delegate. As usual a great number of resolutions were passed; plans for the complete organization of every town in the state made; and a bold endorsement of absolute prohibition voted upon favorably. It was clearly recognized that the campaign had begun again as it had in the early fifties, and a petition was prepared to be sent to the next legislature. It was as follows:

The the General Assembly of the State of Indiana: The undersigned respectfully petition your honorable body to pass a law which shall effectually prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage.¹⁴

In June of 1868 still another movement began. This was known as the State Temperance Alliance. It was composed of all of the temperance men and women of all of the churches and Sunday schools of the state. In addition to this they also included the various other temperance organizations. It was organized with one idea in mind which, according to M. H. Mendenhall, pastor of the Grace Methodist Episcopal church, was to harmonize the various views and sentiments of the temperance people of the state after a full and untrammelled

discussion of any question connected with the promotion of temperance principles and prohibition legislation.¹⁵ And for a time, at least it did have considerable influence for it did a great deal to preserve what had already been done, and also created a desire for further and better legislation. However, the people at the head of the organization were of the opinion that the liquor forces could be out-manuevered so they began to work on a flanking movement—the local option idea. At that time the town or township was made the unit, and if a majority of the voters of such unit should vote against the traffic then they might have prohibition in that territory for the year, while those not voting in favor of it were to be left to the tender mercies and sympathies of the traffic.

But during this same year the Alliance, meeting in Richmond, decided almost unanimously to demand absolute prohibition as the duty of the state and to fight under that banner only. They also gave notice to the politicians that until their homes were protected by law from the liquor traffic, that they were to be counted out of all political parties which would not aid them. In addition to this they recognized that they must begin at the foundation of the matter using every agency, such as the churches and Sunday schools, “to teach the doctrine of total abstinence.”¹⁶ Much more might be given concerning the movements but enough has been given to show the trend of thought and action. It clearly indicates that the work of the temperance forces was on the up-grade again after over ten years of almost complete failure.

And during these ten years there had been a very small amount of liquor legislation. Especially was this true until sometime after 1870. Of course, there had been some but it was meagre and inefficient. What there was, was much as follows: The fragment of the prohibition law of 1853 remained for a time after the destruction of the law of 1855 but it was only a fragment and, therefore, of no real consequence throughout the state. What was left of it was finally repealed on December 21, 1858; this left the state with no law whatever.¹⁷ However, in March of 1859 the General Assembly passed a law which provided that no person should sell intox-

icating liquors in less quantities than a quart without first securing a license, nor could any person without a license sell any intoxicating liquors to be drank about the premises where it was sold. Such a license had to be obtained from the county commisioners. But before the license was issued to him he had to give at least twenty days notice in the weekly newspaper of the exact locality where he intended to open shop. During the twenty days that intervened before the board of commisioners met, any legal voter in the district was given the privilege of remonstrating in writing on account of the immorality or other unfitness of the individual. After the board had been assured of his fitness in every respect he was granted the license to keep a saloon for the period of one year. Such license cost the applicant fifty dollars in addition to which he had to furnish suitable bond. Along with this went some regulations as to his conduct. No liquor might be sold on Sunday or on any election day, or to any person under twenty-one years of age, or to any intoxicated person and others who were in the habit of becoming intoxicated. Also in cases where notice had been given by the wife, mother, sister, brother or father concerning their relative the saloon-keeper was not allowed legally to sell liquor. Adequate penalties ranging from five to five hundred dollars fine and not to exceed thirty days in jail were provided for the law-breaker.¹⁸

Another act was passed during the same month providing for the reimbursement out of the county treasury of any person or persons who had suffered loss by seizure and destruction of property under the prohibitory law of 1855; besides this, the court costs of individuals who had been arrested at that time were returned to them by the act.¹⁹

Still another act was passed this same year. This one provided that no person or persons should be permitted to sell intoxicating liquors within one mile of any place of worship or agricultural fair except at a regular place of business. A penalty of from five to twenty-five dollars was provided for the violators of this act.²

After these meagre and floundering attempts practically

nothing more was done until long after the Civil war period. To be sure, there was some slight legislation in the year of 1861 but it was in the nature of revision of previous laws. It provided that any applicant for license, or any one remonstrating, may appeal from the action of the commissioners, to the circuit or common pleas courts, and may demand a jury; the decision of the jury shall be final without appeal therefrom.²¹ After this we pass over a period of four years with no mention of the subject in the legislature. However, during the year of 1865 the law of 1859 was so amended as to attach a penalty of not less than ten nor more than fifty dollars for any person having a license to sell on Sunday, election days, or other national holidays, or to persons under the age of twenty-one years, or to persons in a state of intoxication.²² This concludes the legislation during the first half of this cycle or up until 1873.

A brief summary may be given at this place to point out the salient features of the movement. To begin with the forces that had brought about the reforms of 1855 had been thus far to a large degree inactive. On the other hand, there were three factors that consumed the time, money and energy of every temperance society. These were the slavery question and its agitation previous to 1861; the War of the Rebellion; and, the Reconstruction period. Because of the resulting conditions the lesser evil of intemperance was thrust into the background. We have already mentioned the work of such societies as The Templars of Honor and Temperance, The Order of Good Templars, The Sons of Temperance, and others. As has been suggested it can be summed up by saying that they remained in a sort of passive state during the national crisis, to become slightly active after the close of the war. In addition to these societies that had already grown up there were many others in the process of organization. The work of these has already been characterized as the pioneer movement of the return to a better status of affairs. Chief among these were the National Temperance Society, and the State Temperance Alliance. These were prominently active in nearly every movement which had for its object total abstinence.

The former, particularly, demanded that the question of prohibition be separated from partisan politics. As in nearly all of the other great movements of this kind practically all of their members were from the best, truest and most sturdy people of the community. Most of them were educated beyond the common education of the day, and a large share of them were church members.

(To be Continued)

A Pioneer Wedding

LETTER FROM CATHERINE M. NOBLE TO MARGARET A. SULLIVAN

Indianapolis, May, June, 6th, '40.

My Dearest Friend:

I persued your letter with a mixture of pleasure and pain. I was delighted to haer from the dearest girls to me on earth and was pained when I found that you were wounded at my sending notice of my marriage with the respects of Mrs. A. H. Davidson, and that you imagined that as I was forming new interests that I had not still a place in my heart for you. I will tell you about the paper. I requested M. Davidson to get me a journal containing a notice of our marriage, to send you. He got it and wrote on it and addressed it to you with his own. hand. He said with the respects of Mrs. A. H. D. as much for fun, of seeing it written as for any thing, else, and I know, he did not once think that respects would sound cold and formal and as I was dressing for making rather returning calls I did not write myself. Mag, forget this and feel assured that there is not another girls on the earth, for whom I entertain pure, disinterested, unmixed affection except yourself, you Mag. Since you, ', have been away form you I have learned how, to, appreciate your excellent and amiable qualities. I am not flattering. Not ,a, day passes away that I do not remember you and am not reminded of some act of or exppression of kindness towards me. Mag I have to dwell on your character, energy is your prominent characteristick. In yourself are united two qualities which are irristible, the most acute sensitiveness, to joy or grief in your own person, and the most lively sympathy with the feelings of others. Mag excuse me but I can ,not, refrain form pouring out the sentiment of my heart and soul in regard to yourself. I will now tell you about my wedding how I was attired for the occasion. On the 19th about 7 o'clock we were united hand and heart in the pphesence of nearly 200, hundred persons. I cannot say in their presence for they had to stand in the front hall, and in the yard, and of course there were many that did not witness the

ceremony. The candles were not lighted until afterwards. My dress was of White Satin very rich and thick dead white. The bosom made with folds across, with one row of shell trimming deep blonde on the sleeves. My gloves white kid satin on the tops and edged with blonde. My hair was plaited behind and my Grecian curls were curled very beautifully and worn behind curls in front. Mock orange blossoms were sent to me to wear in my hair. I wore them in front buried in my curls and beautiful white rose in behind. My shoes were of light kid they were entirely white at candle light. My pocketkerchief was trimmed with lace. Mrs. Williams came in the room we were in before the gentlemen came and she offered me her chain and watch which I wore and completed my dress. E. Browning's dress was of some thin kind of goods of I do not know the name with a broad satin stripe and a vine in it and something between the stripes. It was very beautiful, looked like a blonde dress. M. Yandis' dress was trimmed with satin on the skirts and on the bosoms likewise Jane Rings. They all looked well. Pretty E. B. and Dr. Bobbs went first. 'I mistake) O. Neal and J. R. went in first, and stepped to the right of the fire place in the front parlour, Jane retaining O. N's arm, and then E.B. and Dr. B. went in next, and stood to the left near the folding doors, she still leaning on Dr. B's arm. M. Y. and Hubbard^o went in and parted to make room for Mr. Davidson and Catherine who followed and stood between M. Y. and Hubbard, Catherine still having D's arm, immediately in the front of the fire place. Imagine us arranged Mr. Beecher^o in front of the semicircle, and dozen upon the sofa composed as one could be on any occasion. I felt Mr. Davidson's heart beat next to my arm. Now the prayer begins which is quite long beautifully appropriate, mutilated, it made me thrill with emotions pleasure of the most peculiar character. Beecher knew all the circumstances of the former engagement, and he made a very delicate allusion to it. The ceremony was short. Mr. Beecher kissed us both and said it was done now he was sick and was carried into a room to lie down. My attendants were the first to kiss me. When the door was thrown open for us to enter the parlour there was Duncan standing immediately in the view. May I ought perhaps not

to mention Duncan's name but there are subjects I dare not touch upon on paper at least. Wait till I see you. But I digress too often from the subject. Our supper was between eight and nine. The bed was taken out of mother's room, the tables were set one opposite the fire place and then down the sides from one, opposite the fire place in the centre of the room between the tables was a small mahogany candle stand¹¹, round top covered with a white cloth, bearing the Brides cake which was very splendid. A large pyramid was at the head of the table. We had elegant jelly cake and plates, tea, coffee and ice creams were sent around in the parlour afterward I have not told you how Mr. D was dressed. It was a rich suit of Broad cloth black satin vest, stock, frock coat, boots very handsome made for the express purpose, a pocket handkerchief that I gave him. His appearance was fine looked extremely handsome very animated. His attendants were dressed in the same style. Well Mag I am as happy as mortal man can make me! I feel as if I had indeed, entered into a new state of being and that I had my part to perform in great theatre of human life as if a good was expected from me, and that I know must begin to take my own stand in society and must depend upon myself. I wish you were in the same existance and near me to begin the world with me. Mag, marry some person and come and live in Indianapolis. When you are engaged won't you let me know? I am invited to dine at Mr. Beecher's today, and I am looking for Mr. D. to come and go with me. We are going to a party tonight at James Morrison's¹². Alex Morrison¹³ has given one which we attended. There will be more parties given, which would have been given were it not for so many being gone to the battle Ground¹⁴. What glorious occasion the greatest political gathering ever known in our country. You have heard of the number estimated to have been present from 40,000 to 60,000. In the evening there was a most brilliant Borealis which was hailed with a shout as an omen of success to the whigs. There was great excitement on Monday as the different delegations passed through with their banners and flags, log cabins toward the Battle Ground. A great many persons went from this place, but no ladies. There has been incessant rains, which

have prevented the ladies from this place from attending, 600 ladies from other parts were there. The day waws fine for convention. Tom called up to see me the evening he arrived. I was much pleased to see him. Isabelle Wick¹⁶ has returned and is preparing to go to housekeepin, and will be ready this coming week. I called to see her. I thought she looked very thin. We had a great number of calls on th next day after our marriage, and someone has been out ever day since. Last evening we had twelve calls, in the afternoon rather.

Parry has returned from the Baltimore Convention.¹⁷ Did not know anything of Mr. D. and I until he got to Cincinnati and then he heard that I was married he was shocked and could not come to see me until yesterday he did not call my name and had very little to say, trembled like an aspen, voice faltered. I am delighted with those articles you ppresented me. The music is pretty very, been very much admired.

I must bring this to a close. Will trouble your self to read it? I have not looked at a word as I have written if you can read I will be glad. Do write soon and I will be glad to hear from you as often as you will write, I will take just the same interest in you and your, mutilated, formerly. My feelings have not changed in regard to any, illegible, young person's love. Don't mention when you write, either Duncan's or Parry's name. I will not show your letters to Mr. D. if you do not wish it I will not let him know anything that you might want to say to me alone.

Adeu dearest friend, Mag, I remain
stilll your friend Catherine M. N. Davidson.

Mrs McClure left us evening before last for Madison on her way to Virginia she will visit Mrs. H's some time.

Miss M. A. Sullivan, Madison, Indiana.

Americanism 100 Years Ago

Pine Township, October 30th, 1816.

Dear Children:

I received yours of the 14th of May, 1816, which contributed much to my satisfaction to find you in health and that God in his adorable providence has blessed you with an husband to your mind and thereby increased your family unto a flock gracing your table round. I pray that he may be like the goat going before his flock in the ways of truth and holiness, raising them in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

By these you may learn that I am yet in the place of hope enjoying a moderate state of health at present, a blessing bestowed upon me which I have to be thankful for and among the many blessings I enjoy, I have ground of rejoicing that Providence has planted me in a land of liberty both civil and ecclesiastical. We enjoy peace and plenty, and none to make us afraid. We have the gospel here in its purity, having two Convenating ministers, not more than ten miles the furthest, and about four the nighest. We have no cause of complaint in respect of high rents, as we pay none, nor dares the Rector of his cure, approach our door to call for the tenth of our labor. We enjoy the fruits of our labor in a land of liberty. We have no cause to complain even of taxation. Our county tax is small, perhaps two or three dollars per year. William Hutchman's estate tax last year came to seventy-three cents for 166 acres of land, besides all his taxable property. When you compare these taxes with your dog tax you might wish you were safe out of Egyptian bondage, but Issachorlike, you couch under two burdens. When I am led to look over the Atlantic and enumerate the numberless acts of oppression wherewith you are treated, it makes me wish that all my friends and well-wishers were safe landed on Columbus' peaceful shores. Thus I communicate my best wishes to you, but will not dare to counsel any. I would wish to see you before I dee in Alleghany County, where you and your little one might be safe from under the iron hand of oppression. Pittsburgh is

the capital of Alleghany County, where we sell our produce. Flour sells now from four to five dollars per hundred potatoes half dollar per bushel; butter at two shilings or thirty cents per pound; turnips fifty cents per bushel of half dollar; meat at from six to eighteen cents per pound; eggs at twenty cents per dozen. The common laboring man has one dollar and eleven cents per day and finds himself. A young man has about sixteen dollars a month and found in the country with us, as we live about nine miles from the city. We pay seveney-five cents for making a pair of shoes. Money is not so plenty as it has been for some time past, but still we have no cause of complaint. We have different prices in land, just as it is situated, and according to location as it is in quality. First rate land nigh to the city sells at one hundred dollars per acre, etc., some fifty, some twenty, and ten, etc., but land thirty or forty miles from the city sells at three, some two, and some less, according to its quality and location. Our common cows sell for from sixteen to twenty dollars per head. By this scale you can weigh the situation. You may keep any number of cattle in the summer if you can winter them. Thus you see small taxes, no rents, if you purchase land of your own; no tithes; no duties; none to oppress you; we live under our own vine, and none to make us afraid. If we will work there is no fear of want, and there is employment for all kinds of the different kinds of tradesmen, or farmers, young or old. Time would fail to me to tell you of the different kinds of machines employed in the city. It is supposed to be one of the most flourishing cities in the United States. The grocery business is very advantageous one here, as the city lies in the fork of the Alleghany and Monongahela Rivers, which form the Ohio River and runs through a vast extensive country, and form the Mississippi River, which runs upwards for seventeen hundred miles and empties into the ocean below the city of New Orleans, where General Jackson gave John Bull's gallant troops a complete drubbing on the 8th day of January, 1815, where Johnnie Bull lost 2,500 men, with the loss of two men killed and five or seven wounded on our side. So terrible were they handled by our troops and so tremendous and continuous was our cannon and small arms, that Johnnie Bull's men, to save

their lives, lay down among the slain and pulled the dead corpses over them, and when Wellington's old veterans fled from the field, they rose and gave themselves up, prisoners of war. So panic stricken were Johnnie Bull's men that they ran, leaving their slain half buried.

Now when you see Johnnie Bull, tell him we live free and happy, under one of the best constitutions in the world. Nor need he come any more to disturb our peace, lest it fare worse with him for Yankee Doodle says he will live free, and now he is prepared to meet him by land or sea.

I could wish such spirit was found in all my friends and relations, and it might prevail on them to come and enjoy a part of our liberty and freedom. There is nothing wanting here, either civil or religious liberty, to contribute to our happiness. We have now four placed ministers in the bounds of the congregation, that the Rev. Mr. Black formerly occupied, viz., the Rev. William Gibson, Mr. Williams, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Black. Here you see how religion is prevailing, as there is yet a vacancy for one or more on these bounds... We are here supported in the free exercise of our religious sentiments, by the civil constitution of the United State, hence we have nothing to fear from the quarter.

Your sister Elizabeth and family are well and desire to be remembered in love to you and family. She has five children, two sons and three daughters, Joseph, Samuel, Mary Ann, Sarah, and Rachael Campbell.

Sister Sarah and family are in health and desirous to be remembered with love to you and family. She has four children alive, three sons and one daughter, viz., Nance, Boggs, Samuel, Mary Ann and Josiah Hutchman. Dear daughter. time would fail me to write to you the blessings and privileges which we, by the kind providence of God, enjoy in the land of liberty, but I shall here conclude by hereby transmitting my love and best respect to you and family, and particularly to my aged and loving father, if yet alive. We perhaps may never meet again in time, but that we meet daily at the throne of grace, and that his prayers for me may be that we meet at a throne of Glory, where sighing and sorrow shall be no more. Remember me to brother Hance and family, brother Rabert

and family and brother Archibald and family, brother and sister Gordon and family, and all inquiring friends or neighbors. I add no more but remain your loving mother.

MARY BOGGS.

N. B. We received your letter of May 20th, 1816, but none else from 1807. I wish you to lose no opportunity of writing to us, and let us know of James Cummins, as we have no account of him, only he was the bearer of your letter.

Indiana In the Mexican War

By R. C. Buley, M.A.

(Continued)

THE BUENA VISTA CONTROVERSY

The Buena Vista controversy grew out of General Taylor's statement:

the Second Indiana ,which had fallen back as stated could not be rallied, and took no further part in the action, except a handful of men, who under its gallant Colonel, Bowles, joined the Mississippi regiment, and did good service, and those fugitives who, at a later period in the day, assisted in defending the train and depot at Buena Vista.¹

This condemnation of the volunteers of the Second, and the inference of cowardice, not only angered the volunteers thoroughly but so affected the reputation of the state that it suffered for years, in fact until the stigma was removed by the Civil war. Concerning this part of Taylor's report General Lew Wallace writes:

In all American history there is not another sentence which, taken as a judgement of men in mass, equals that one in cruelty and injustice; none so wanton in misstatement, none of malice so obstinately adhered to by its author, none so comprehensive in its damage, since it dishonored a whole state, and though half a century has passed, still holds the state subject to stigma.

At first the words of Taylor piqued only the volunteers of the Second regiment, but his failure to correct his statement after his attention had been called to his mistake, together with other things which he had said concerning the volunteers, made enemies of practically all Indiana troops. In 1847, immediately following the Buena Vista campaign, the disputed points concerning the Second were of interest to only a few hundred men and their friends; in 1848 the dispute was turned into campaign material and intimately concerned a doubtful state and the national election. It was in this rehashing of the whole affair that the controversy took on its most bitter aspects.

1. Taylor, Official Report, *National Documents*, 1846-7, p 134.

The controversy resolved itself into three separate questions. First, why did the Second regiment leave the field, from fear or by order? If by order, why was the order given and who was responsible for it? Second, how much of the regiment rallied and finished the fight? Third, did General Taylor know the facts of the case and did he neglect to correct his report after he had learned the cause of the retreat?

The first and second of these questions are very closely related, for definite knowledge of the number rallied would do much to determine whether the men retreated from orders, or because of the odds against them, or whether they were just naturally cowards. From General Taylor's words one would infer the latter to be true.²

The fact of the retreat of the Second was presented in the official reports in various ways. From General Taylor's report came the following:

The Second Indiana and Second Illinois regiments formed this part of our line, the former covering three pieces of light artillery, under the orders of Captain O'Brien, Brigadier-General Lane being in immediate command. In order to bring his men within effective range, General Lane ordered the artillery and the Second Indiana forward. The Artillery, advanced within musket range of a heavy body of Mexican infantry, and was served against it with great effect, but without being able to check its advance. The infantry ordered to its support had fallen back in disorder, being exposed, as well as the battery, not only to a severe fire of small arms from the front but also to a murderous cross-fire of grape and cannister from a Mexican battery on the left.³

Brigadier-General Lane reported as follows:

About 9 o'clock I was informed by Colonel Churchill that the enemy were advancing toward my position in great force, sheltering themselves in a deep ravine which runs up towards the mountain directly in my front. I immediately put my columns in motion, consisting of those eight battalion companies and Lieutenant O'Brien's battery, amounting in all to about 400 men, to meet them. The enemy, when they deployed from the ravine and appeared on the ridge displayed a force of about 4,000 infantry, supported by a large body of lancers. The infantry immediately opened a most destructive fire, which was returned by my small command, both infantry and artillery, in a most gallant manner for some time. I soon perceived that I was too far from the enemy for my muskets to take the deadly effect which I desired, and immediately sent my

2. For placement of troops and position of Second Indiana see description above.

3. Taylor, Official Report, *National Documents*, 1846-7, p 135-6.

aide-de-camp to Lieutenant O'Brien, directing him to place his battery in a more advanced position, with the determination of advancing my whole line. By this movement I should not only be near the enemy, but should also bring the company on my extreme left more completely into action, as the brow of the hill impeded their fire. By this time the enemy's fire of musketry and the raking fire of ball and grapeshot of their battery posted on my left had become so terrible, and my infantry instead of advancing, as was ordered,⁴ I regret to say retired in some disorder⁴ from their position, notwithstanding my own and the severe efforts of my officers to prevent them.⁵

General Wool, to whom the disposition of the troops was largely trusted, reported in much the same manner as Taylor:

In connection with this movement, a heavy column of the enemy's infantry and cavalry and battery on the side of the mountain moved against our left, which was held by Bragadier-General Lane, with the Second Indiana regiment, and Lieutenant O'Brien's section of artillery, by whom the enemy's fire was warmly returned and, owing to the range, with great effect. General Lane, agreeably to my orders, wishing to bring his infantry within striking distance ordered his line to move forward. This order was duly obeyed by Lieutenant O'Brien. The infantry, however, instead of advancing, retired in disorder; and, in spite of the utmost efforts of their general and his officers, left the artillery unsupported and fled the field of battle. Some of them were rallied by Colonel Bowles, who, with the fragment, fell in the ranks of the Mississippi riflemen and during the day did good service with that gallant regiment. I deeply regret to say that most of them did not return to the field, and many of them continued their flight to Saltillo.⁶

Lieutenant O'Brien, to whose support the Second was ordered, threw no additional light on the subject.

On arriving at the point indicated, I found myself within musket range of about three hundred Mexican infantry, while their battery, three hundred yards on my left, was pouring in heavy discharges of grape and cannister. I opened the fire against the infantry and lancers with tremendous effect. Every shot, whether cannister or shell, seemed to tell. The enemy fell back. I advanced on him about fifty yards. He was strongly reinforced, until in fact, I found his main body pressing on me. The pieces were admirably served, but failed any longer to check his advance. Every gap in the Mexican ranks was closed as soon as made. On looking around at this moment, I discovered that the tremendous cross-fire of the enemy had forced the regiment ordered to my support to fall back.⁷

4. This word "ordered" was amended to "as I intended" in supplementary report of March 24, 184.

5. Lane's Report, *National Documents*, 181-2.

6. General Wool's Report, *National Documents*, 1846-7, 147.

7. O'Brien's Report, *National Documents*, 1846-7, p 160.

These reports portray the retreat of the Second as it would have appeared to an observer at a distance. General Taylor did not see this move, and if Wool saw it, it was from a distance. Lieutenant O'Brien was some distance in front of the regiment and so busily engaged that he did not see the Second break and retire. Altho General Lane was in immediate command of the regiment and in the near vicinity at the moment, he was at a loss to account for the withdrawal. For the real causes of the move one must look to the testimony of the men themselves and the subsequent reports of the court of inquiry which were based upon the direct evidence obtained shortly after the battle.

After General Lane ordered forward Lieutenant O'Brien, that officer took his three guns, advanced over two hundred yards in front of the other troops and took up his position at the head of the third gorge.⁸ The battery worked well and made great gaps in the Mexican line, but did not check the advance. The Second regiment, in the meantime, was holding its own admirably, altho it was a struggle of four hundred against four thousand. It was at this time that General Lane ordered O'Brien, in order to get more effective results, to limber up and advance sixty yards to the right and front.⁹ Before the aide-de-camp had time to return from delivering this order to the battery, and while General Lane was still waiting for his return in order to give the necessary orders for advancing the troops, they gave way on the right and in a few minutes the whole line was retreating. The men had fired about twenty-one rounds when the companies on the right broke and retired. Some of the men on the left started to follow, while others held firm and begged their comrades to remain. But the desire to follow overcame all arguments and the bravest reasoned that there was no use to remain longer. The case for Indiana and the Second depended on the establishment of one fact, namely, that the regiment was ordered to retreat by its colonel. Three times Colonel Bowles gave the order "Cease firing, and retreat!" before the regiment obeyed.¹⁰

8. See description of battle, Chapter II.

9. Carlton, 60.

10. Narrative of Lieutenant-Colonel W. R. Haddon. Description of the proceedings at the Battle of Buena Vista. Written for *Western Sun and Advertiser*... Also letter from soldier of Second for the *Sentinel*, August 17, 1848, written at Buena Vista, March 13, 1847.

The motives which prompted Colonel Bowles to give this order have never been satisfactorily explained. Charges of cowardice sprang from all sides. They ranged in seriousness from that of the soldier who said that Bowles dismounted as soon as the firing began and endeavored to shield himself by staying immediately in the rear of his troops with his horse between him and the enemy's battery,¹¹ to those which affirmed that he merely gave the order in a moment of panic and was sorry of it a few minutes later. It was even rumored that Bowles mistrusted the impenetrability of his horse and retired to a gully where he was later found by his men in hiding, but there is no authentic foundation for this charge. It is certain that the colonel conducted himself in this part of the battle in a manner but little calculated to inspire his men with confidence either in his leadership or personal bravery.

The publicity given this affair threw members of the Second in a very bad light. Some of the blame was placed upon the shoulders of General Lane, especially by his political enemies. General Lane, in order to place the blame where it rightfully belonged, preferred charges against Colonel Bowles. General Taylor refused to permit a court martial because the conduct of Bowles had been extolled by Colonel Davis of the Mississippi regiment, which Bowles joined. More over in the two weeks after the battle that Taylor remained at Saltillo he had heard nothing injurious to Bowles's reputation. He further stated that he did not believe the charges could be substantiated.¹²

General Lane, failing in his attempt to relieve the regiment from blame and vindicate his own reputation from all insinuations and charges, by a court martial, decided upon the next best means. Colonel Bowles seemed perfectly willing to take Taylor's advice and "let the matter drop" and stifle all investigation on the subject. He showed no inclination to ask for a court of inquiry to vindicate himself, so General Lane asked for one to investigate his own conduct on the battle field. The decision of this court was announced by General Wool in Orders No. 279.

11. Soldier of Buena Vista to *Sentinel*, written at Buena Vista, March 13, 1847.

As facts the court reported that the Second left the field without any order from General Lane and that thru his exertions from one hundred and fifty to two hundred were rallied and joined the Mississippi and Third Indiana regiments. It was the opinion of the court that during the whole period of the 22nd and 23rd of February, that General Lane conducted himself as a brave and gallant officer and that no censure attached to him for the retreat of the Second Indiana.¹²

With General Lane thus absolved from all responsibility for the retreat, Colonel Bowles was placed in a very bad light. At last public opinion compelled him to ask for a court of inquiry on his own conduct. This court, with Colonel Bissel at the head, was provided by General Wool and convened at the Buena Vista camp, April 12, 1847.

The charges which General Lane had preferred against Colonel Bowles were two in number and serious. They were backed by specific instances illustrating each. First, Colonel Bowles was unable and incompetent to discharge the duties of colonel. He was ignorant of the tactics used in battalion and company drill as well as those of brigade drill. He was ignorant of the movements necessary to meet and repel a charge of the enemy, as shown on the night of February 22 on the field of Buena Vista. Second, violation of the fifty-second article of war. In the battle of Buena Vista he had, himself,

12. The following is Taylor's letter:

Headquarters Army of Occupation,
Camp near Monterey, March 23, 1847.

Brigadier-General Wool, U.S.A.
Buena Vista, Mexico.

General:

The charges against Colonel Bowles included in your communication of the 14th have been duly submitted to the commanding general, who directs me to say that under all the circumstances he is not disposed to order a court martial in the case. By reference to the official reports of the engagement at Buena Vista it is seen that the personal conduct of Colonel Bowles is extolled by yourself and Colonel Davis, with whose regiment he was associated after the flight of his own. In nearly two weeks that the general remained at Saltillo after the battle he heard no syllable breathed against the reputation of Colonel Bowles nor does he now believe that the charge affecting his conduct in the battle can be substantiated. His own official report, based upon the best evidence he could obtain, speaks well for the conduct of Colonel Bowles and he will not consent to entertain the charges against him. They should have been preferred at an earlier day. Should Colonel Bowles desire a court of inquiry in this case I am directed to say that you are authorized by the commanding general to grant it, but the general thinks it is best for all concerned to let the matter drop.

I am, sir, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

W. S. Bliss.

Assitant Adjutant-General.

From *New Albany Democrat*, August 24, 1848.

13. Orders No. 279; issued from headquarters at Buena Vista, April 26, 1847. *New Albany Democrat*, August 24, 1848.

while in command of the regiment, misbehaved before the enemy by giving to the regiment, while engaged with and under the fire of the enemy, the unnecessary and unofficerlike order "Cease firing, and retreat." In consequence of this order the regiment retreated and was thrown into such confusion that is never could be completely rallied. After giving and repeating this order Colonel Bowles had shamefully run away from the enemy and abandoned his post in the presence of the enemy, which post he had been commanded by his superior officer to maintain and defend. Furthermore after leaving his post and regiment he took shelter alone in a ravine near the scene of action. Before retiring to the ravine and while still in command of his regiment he had dismounted from his horse in the rear of the regiment and taken shelter from the enemy's fire behind it."

The court of inquiry, after diligently examining the evidence reported the following facts. In relation to the first charge the evidence seemed to indicate that Colonel Bowles was ignorant of company, battalion and brigade drill, and that the maneuver of the 22nd of February was an indication of ignorance of battalion drill. With reference to the second charge the evidence seemed to indicate that Colonel Bowles, when General Lane was present, gave the order, "Cease firing and retreat," but that he had no authority from General Lane to do so. Bowles also retreated after giving the order, but did not shamefully run away from the enemy or hide in a ravine from the enemy and his regiment. Altho the colonel had dismounted from his horse in the rear of his regiment there was no evidence to show that he used his horse for protection. The order to retreat did induce the regiment to leave its position and was given for that purpose, but the court did not find that Bowles had been ordered particularly to maintain his position.

In the opinion of the court, Bowles was ignorant of the duties of colonel and that ill-health and absence on account of ill-health had, in some degree, prevented him from acquainting himself with the duties of that office, the court believed that at the time Bowles gave the order to retreat he was under

the impression that the artillery had retreated, when it had merely advanced under the orders of General Lane. These orders had not been made known to the commander of the Second. In conclusion the court stated that thruout the engagement and during the whole day Colonel Bowles exhibited no lack of personal courage or bravery, but that he did manifest want of capacity and judgement as a commander.

In spite of the fact that Bowles had been with the regiment but a short time, the men of the Second were thoroughly acquainted with their Colonel and his incompetence before they went into the battle of Buena Vista, and did not have to wait for the court of inquiry to inform them that he was unfitted to perform the offices of colonel. The most conspicuous example illustrating Colonel Bowles' thorough ignorance of military form and tactics was his conduct on the evening of February 22, just before the battle.¹⁵ The Second, camped on the field, was surprised by a body of horsemen supposed to have been lancers trying to outflank it. The alarm was given. Colonel Bowles called the regiment to attention and began maneuvers to put it into position to receive the charge.

In his ignorance of tactics he got the regiment drawn up with "left in front" and while maneuvering to get right it might easily have been cut to pieces.¹⁶ Fortunately the alarm was caused only by the American horse returning from water.

At this display of ignorance and incapacity in an hour of danger, a great number among the officers and men became unwilling to further trust their lives and honor in his hands. A committee was sent to General Lane requesting him to be with the regiment on the following day, and this he promised **faithfully to do.**¹⁷ No disrespect was meant for Colonel Bowles except as a military commander. Most of the men believed him to be intelligent, courteous and humane, and judged by actions during the engagement there seemed no reasons to doubt his or Colonel Haddon's bravery.¹⁸ Colonel Bowles was a physician of scientific attainments, brave, ambitious, pleasant-mannered and easy-going, but he could not master the elements of tactics practiced at the time.¹⁹

15. This is the instance referred to in Lane's charges.

16. Scribner, *A Campaign in Mexico*, 62. Scribner was present on this occasion.

17. *Ibid.*, 63.

18. Scribner, 63.

19. Wallace, *Autobiography*, 183.

On the field of Buena Vista the Second regiment was laboring under a dual commandership which made possible the contradictory orders and the resulting calamity. A very close attachment had arisen between the regiment and its late colonel, Lane. The general continued to camp with it, and after his promotion took it with him as he changed location. The relation between the two was very similar to that existing between General Taylor and the First Mississippi. Practically, Lane remained colonel and Bowles had the title. Lane looked after the discipline and welfare of the men. He drilled them very carefully himself. To these intimate relations Colonel Bowles made no objections and he was not in the leastwise jealous. His tastes were along other lines than military. He was known, when the regiment was on parade ground under Lane, to ride into camp with a batch of botanical specimens from the surrounding country.²⁰ He possessed no sense of the responsibility of his command. The men, on the whole, tolerated him good naturedly, little dreaming of the trouble this dual colonelcy would bring upon them.

On the field of Buena Vista the Third Indiana the only other regiment in Lane's brigade, was placed in reserve by General Wool. This left General Lane in actual command of only O'Brien's battery of three guns and the Second Indiana. So the regiment went into battle with two colonels. Should they fail to act in unison the result could easily be imagined. And this is precisely what happened.

The Mexicans started action at dawn. The American army was alert at three o'clock but not formed into battle line. General Lane knew it would not do for the Mexican battery to catch his companies unformed. So he ordered "Fall in." In a few minutes Colonel Churchill of General Wool's staff came with the report that the Mexicans were fainting down the road, but that the real attack would come from the ravine toward him. Without telling Bowles, who was at the rear of the extreme right company, Lane rode around to the front

20. Wallace, 183.

21. Wallace, 185.

and, seeing the formation ready, ordered "Forward-guide center march!"²¹ This was the beginning of the double colonelcy.

From the ravine poured the Mexicans until the two whole divisions of Lombardini and Pacheco were in battle line. It had been Lane's object to reach a place where he could control the ravine as the Mexicans came out. When he saw that he was too late he halted the regiment and sent O'Brien into battery. Then he rode to the rear by the left flank. Had he gone by the right flank he could have communicated his desires to the other colonel. As Lane did all the commanding directly there was no means of Bowles knowing the General's plans. The men went to their knees at Lane's command and at his orders began firing. There were about three hundred and sixty men in the ranks, all within easy range of the battery of five eight-pounders which enfiladed them left and right. It was this battery that made it imperative to shift the regiment. When Lane saw the Mexicans in front faltering, he decided to move forward, in order to get closer. Robinson, Lane's adjutant-general, delivered the order, which was at once obeyed.²² At the same time from his position behind the last company or the left (McRae's) Lane called out the command, "Forward!" It was then that he noticed that the companies on the right were retreating on the run.

Such being the case the question arises, who was to blame for the conflicting orders? Did the position of the regiment and the odds against which it was fighting justify the order to retreat? It is hard to fix definitely the blame for the lack of teamwork between the two commanders of the regiment. Undoubtedly General Lane should have delivered his orders thru Colonel Bowles, or at least have communicated his plans to him. As long as Bowles remained colonel in name the men had to obey him. But General Lane was a man of action. He knew the men looked to him as their real leader. They had obeyed his every command thus far in the battle. Amid the excitement of the conflict General Lane seemed completely to have forgotten the existence of Colonel Bowles. He had been getting results by direct commands to the men, and had no reasons to believe that they would fail to execute this most im-

22. Wallace, 187.

portant order. Unfortunately Colonel Bowles' plans were not the same.

The friends of Colonel Bowles and some of the political enemies of General Lane attempted to show that the order to retreat was the only sensible one to give under the circumstances and that because of it no charge of cowardice would be justified. It is also but just to add that among many officers of long experience the belief prevailed that the prime fault was one of rashness and want of judgement in placing this force in a position, which, they contended, neither this nor any other regiment could have maintained. Moreover, it was a position which it was necessary to hold as one upon which others depended. Those who held this view thought it no more than right that Lane should bear a part of the odium which the regiment could not escape.

The disparity of numbers alone would have justified the withdrawal of the American force to the main line of battle. If General Lane knew the weight of the column he had gone forth to engage before he encountered it, I think the world will rather stand in amazement at his rashness than lost in the admiration of his wisdom.²³

Marshall thought that surely General Lane did not know of the Mexican battery on the left before it opened with the grape and cannister. If the column of the Second regiment formed line to the front facing the Saltillo road with its right flank toward the Second Illinois, the rear had been engaged in attack of the Mexican brigade which had been engaged in the mountains early in the morning, the left flank was left open to the raking fire of the battery, and the front to the fire and charges of infantry variously estimated at from four to seven thousand. If the line was drawn parallel to the line of battle then the left flank cut the Mexican line of battle, while the handful of Indianians was beyond the reach of support from the American lines. Its overthrow was practically inevitable before a gun fired.²⁴

The General's confidence must have been as overwhelming as his conduct was brilliant. if, before he commenced this knight errantry of four hundred against four or six thousand, sustained by cavalry and

23. Colonel Humphrey Marshall in his reply to Lane's supplementary report, *Tri-weekly Journal*, July 12, 1847.

24. Marshall, *Tri-weekly Journal*, July 12, 1847.

artillery, he thot of giving me an order to advance on the enemy and cut them off in case they should retreat before him. The General was no doubt zealous and sanguine, but he never informed me that his hopes reached this extent. There is no necessity to comment upon his declaration that , after losing ninety men, he ordered the three hundred and ten who were left to advance on the foe,, more than four thousand strong, so as to get within fifty yards to resume the fire. I do not blame the Second Indiana for retreating under the state of case made out by the Brigadier-General commanding them. That the retreat was made in confusion resulted from the nature of the ground they were compelled to traverse, those very obstacles which should have been kept in front to impede the progress of the enemy.²⁵

Such was the criticism of Lane's tactics by a soldier recommended by Taylor for his coolness and bravery. Bissell's regiment was the nearest to the Second Indiana and he had ample means of knowing both the lay of the land and the chances of success of the Indianians.

There were other officers, however, of equal experience, who believed that Lane's plan was sound and success prevented only by the unforeseen. Lane, ordered by General Wool to move forward and meet the enemy who were advancing in numbers, so judiciously selected his ground that a better spot could not have been chosen.²⁶ It was the only place where the small force could present as large a front as an enemy, who, with their numbers, upon other ground might have completely surrounded and destroyed it. The best way of judging the chances of success of the arrangement is to note how near it came to succeeding. General Wool told Colonel Bowles, in the presence of General Lane, Colonel Curtis of the Third Ohio, and Major Washington of the artillery, that if he had withheld his order to retreat and carried out the intentions of General Lane to advance, he would have executed one of the most brilliant moves ever executed on any battle field. He used as proof Santa Anna's official report, where that general stated that he had already passed an order for his forces to retreat, when the enemy, after a most determined resistance, was observed to give way in great confusion. The report of the Mexican Engineers adds further weight to the statement that the Mexi-

25. Bissell, *Ibid*.

26. Scribner, *Campaign in Mexico*, 63. Scribner at first considered Lane's plan unsound but after surveying the ground with more leisure and coolness, he judged success highly probable.

cans were about ready to retire when the retreat of their opponents made it necessary.

Many of our corps acted badly, but much havoc, nevertheless, was made among the enemy, and the heights were carried by force of arms. We lost many men, and the new corps of Guanajuto was dispersed. If, at that juncture we had been attacked with vigor, we should probably have been defeated.²⁷

With conclusive proof that the order to retreat was given, it remains to determine just what part that order played in causing the retreat of the regiment; whether it was the only cause of retreat or was given after the regiment showed signs of breaking. All evidence points to the conclusion that the order was the impulse "that started the ball rolling." While the men were fighting as bravely as men ever fought and no one was thinking of retreating he (Colonel Bowles) gave the order to "Cease firing, and Retreat!"²⁸ The men had begun firing, a little excitedly it is true, but with aim and effect. It had long been the ambition of the men of the Second to get into a battle and now that they had at last realized their ambition, they intended to make good. Characteristic of new troops, they remained steady as long as they seemed to have a show of success. They seemed hardly to realize the danger of their position. A battery was in front of them mowing down the Mexican lines and breaking up their formation. Their own fire brought very visible results. The enemy, however, filled the gaps and came on with no signs of wavering. Bullets swished by, dirt was spattered over the men, comrades fell and the thousands in front showed no signs of diminishing. Each man had been provided with forty rounds of ammunition each cartridge loaded with a bullet and three buck-shot. The loading was a rather slow process, but after the first thrill of excitement wore away the men did it coolly and systematically. By the time twenty-one rounds had been fired the Mexicans began to falter and their fire grew less effective. This confusion may have been due to the difficulty of maneuvering on the rough ground and more apparent than real. It is reasonably certain, however, that, at this time, with nineteen

27. Report of Mexican engineers, from Carlton, 62.

28. Letter from soldier of the Second, *Indiana Sentinel*, May 9, 1847.

rounds of ammunition remaining, the men were not thinking of retreating. How long the regiment of a scant four hundred men could have stood the strain is problematical. Colonel Bowles did not give them a chance to show this. The very fact that he had to give the order twice, or according to Lieutenant-Colonel Haddon, three times,²⁹ goes to prove that the men were not thinking very much about retiring. To indicate this further, the men who did not hear the order did not retreat until left almost alone. The chances are, that when those within hearing distance of Colonel Bowles heard the order to retreat they suddenly realized the extreme danger of their position. Without stopping to think further they accepted the judgement and order of one whose word would not have had great weight off the field of battle. Very likely they thought the order came from the General in charge. At any rate it was apparently a reasonable command and one easily obeyed.

Once begun the retreat was exactly what could be expected of new troops. Troops like those of Indiana in the Mexican war could be depended upon to defend a position against odds, to advance and lead, to charge even, but not to retreat calmly under fire. This is an accomplishment of veteran troops only. As long as they had their faces to the front and could see the enemy, fear did not affect them. But with faces toward the rear and the Mexican lancers hard upon their trail, the Indians did not stop to dispute the ground, nor could they be persuaded to stop and organize while on their way back.

This brings up the question of how much of the regiment did rally and resume the fight. According to Taylor:

The Second Indiana, which had fallen back could not be rallied and took no further part in the action except a handful of men, who, under its gallant leader Colonel Bowles, joined the Mississippi regiment and did good service, and those fugitives, who at a later period in the day assisted in defending the train and depot at Buena Vista.

Now Taylor's report was based largely upon those of his subordinates. He himself did not witness this part of the battle. Colonel Jefferson Davis, of the First Mississippi, in his report commented upon the personal gallantry of Colonel Bow-

29. Lieutenant-Colonel Haddon's narrative of Buena Vista in *Western Sun and Advertiser*; in Perry, 295.

les,³⁰ and from this source Taylor got his authority for commending the conduct of the colonel of the Second. It was this praise of those who least merited it that made Taylor's words especially obnoxious. The one who failed to perform his duty was reported on favorably. Those who rallied and fought as a regiment, after a retreat caused by this one man, not only failed to receive the praise of their general, but received his condemnation. Indeed General Taylor has been accused of yielding to a common weakness, favoritism to relatives and prejudice for political and sectional considerations.

From a superficial reading of the report one would be led to believe that this Mississippi regiment, commanded by Colonel Davis, son-in-law of Taylor, with three hundred and twenty-eight men rank and file, all told had fought the whole battle and was entitled to all the credit, being occasionally assisted by the Second Kentucky and the First Illinois, commanded by a Kentuckian.³¹

At roll call on February 23 the total membership of the Second did not exceed three hundred and sixty men. Two companies, Osborne's and Walker's, had been taken the day before, to help form the battalion of riflemen under Major Gorman of the Third Indiana. This left in the regiment eight companies averaging forty five men each in the ranks.³² When Bowles gave the order to retreat he seems to have had only one idea of getting himself and the men out of danger. He did not think of appointing a rallying place or of sending the flag to the rear to serve as such. Of course he completely forgot that he himself was subject to order. As soon as the men began the backward movement, Bowles entirely lost communication with them, as a commander.

When General Lane saw the men retreating he looked ahead and saw La Bosca, the ravine, a broad trench lying across the line of flight. To it he rode at full speed, taking with him Lieutenant-Colonel Haddon and Major Cravens. Facing about on the far side of the ravine they confronted the men. Fifteen of them ran by in panic to the sheep ranch nearly a mile away. Approximately one hundred and ninety listened and fell in line. Others who assisted in stemming the tide of retreat were Inspector-General Churchill, Major

30. *National Documents*, 1846-7. p 197.

31. Comment on Taylor's report, by J. B. Hall, *Indiana Tri-weekly Journal*, May 21, 1847.

Munroe of the artillery, Captain Steen of the First dragoons and paymaster Dix.³³ The rest of the men were accounted for by the men in camp the following evening.³⁴

Killed and Wounded	90
Caring for these	40
Rallied by Bowles	25
Rallied at Ranch	15
Rallied by Lane and others	190

Total	360
-------	-----

The court of inquiry placed the number rallied at from one hundred and fifty to two hundred.

Lieutenant-Colonel Haddon's narrative of the battle does not quite agree with that of Carleton nor does Carleton's agree with that of Scribner, yet all three men were present at the battle. The differences are in details only. All agree that the number rallied was about two hundred men. According to Carleton, Major Dix carried the colors and by his pleas got the men to rally about him. Haddon had Private Moberly carrying the banner. The three accounts also differ as to the exact place at which the reassembling took place. At any rate Lieutenant-Colonel Haddon took command and as he passed close by the First Mississippi he ordered out those Indianians whom he saw, telling them that they must fight as Indianians if they wanted to get credit as such. The rallied regiment took path down a ravine and coming upon the Mississippi regiment under Colonel Davis at the bottom, was ordered by General Lane to form alongside it, Here the men fought, under their own commander, during the rest of the engagement. This body of men which rallied and finished the battle under their Lieutenant-Colonel, and consisting of three-fourths of the available men of the regiment, General Taylor entirely overlooked in that part of his report dealing with the retreat of the Second.³⁵

General Taylor's report was based upon personal observation and the reports of the subordinate officers. For the

32. Wallace, *Autobiography*, 184.

33. For Dix's part in this work see Chapter II. above.

34. It was here that Wallace got the apportionment. He believed them and said that if they were untrue there was no honor among men.

35. In the action at Buena Vista the Second Indiana lost 107 men. Only one regiment suffered a greater loss. This fact alone would do much to prove the charges of cowardice an unjust one.

events connected with the Second in the early part of the battle he had to rely wholly upon the latter. There is no evidence that General Taylor had any motive for doing injustice to any of his troops. It was his duty to give a true account of the details of the battle. This report, altho mistaken as to the facts, was no doubt sincere. The only criticism that could be offered would be for hastiness and lack of careful collecting of the facts. The real fault to be found with General Taylor was that, after he was clearly shown to be wrong, he still stubbornly adhered to his original report. His defense was that from March 6, 1847, to May 3, 1848, nothing had ever happened that would impel him in any way to change the words of his official report, and that until such was the case it was his duty to let the report stand. Yet in that time the court of inquiry had been held, the Second exonerated, and the findings approved by General Wool and published by him as an order to the whole army. After deliberate examination of witnesses the court freed the regiment from all blame. With this primary purpose accomplished, Taylor said a year later,³⁶ that such a move could only mean great injury to the Second and the state. He regretted that such forbearance did not suggest itself to those interested.

In one of his letters to George G. Dunn, Taylor said that on examining the official papers on record in the office of his adjutant-general he had found no evidence that the proceedings of the court of inquiry instituted at the request of General Lane were ever sent to him. To the best of his recollection they were not sent. The court was ordered by General Wool and probably he thot it unnecessary to send the proceedings to Taylor. General Taylor severely criticised General Lane for his failure to submit a supplemental report if he thot his first one needed correcting. Taylor says he had nothing to do with Lane's supplementary letter, he would not call it a report, of May 10, 1847. It was not a report. He saw it first in the newspapers. As far as he knew no such was ever made, hence there was no warrant for changing his own detailed report. However, he did change the word "ordered" to "in-

36. Dunn's letter, March 24, 1848, in *Weekly Journal*, April 21, 1848.

tended", agreeable to Lane's supplemental report of March 24.³⁷ Taylor stated that Lane should have called for reports from his subordinates immediately after the battle, and that he did not do this. Bowles never did make any report of the part his regiment played in the battle. Taylor suggested that even at that late time such a report might do some good. The *Paoli Telegraph* of July 22, 1847, contained a document signed by Bowles entitled "A Report of the Part Taken by the Second Regiment of Indiana Volunteers in the Battle of Buena Vista in Mexico, on 22nd and 23rd of February 1847." With one or two exceptions the volunteers said the statements were all false and hooted at the very idea of it. The invitation that Taylor held out to Bowles for a report was taken by many as an insult to the State.

The idea is enough to make the blood boil. Taylor can rest assured that if the report of Lane, the Court of Inquiry, Orders of Wool, the testimony of Colonel Dix, etc. is not sufficient vindication, the people of Indiana will never, never seek such a vindication from the hands of Colonel William A. Bowles.³⁸

It was strange, indeed, that General Taylor would not call Lane's supplementary "letter" a report, exactly what rule of military etiquette forbade it he did not state, and yet was willing to receive personally and forward to the war office a report from Bowles nearly a year after he had ceased to be an officer in the army. It has never been made clear why Taylor seemed to be willing to accept the word of Bowles, not an officer, while to the verdict of a court sanctioned by himself, constituted according to all the forms of the law and founded on the testimony of honorable witnesses, he attached no importance.

As General Lane was returning from Mexico he called on Taylor at Monterey and discussed the retreat of the Second and the court findings. Lane spoke of Taylor's report and the wrong impressions conveyed by it. Taylor gave Lane to understand that he would make a satisfactory explanation of the whole affair and make his report conform to the facts established by the court of inquiry.³⁹ With this assurance Lane

37. This report of May 10, 1847 was Lane's final and detailed account of his command in the battle. When he made his official report he was not satisfied that the regiment had retreated by order from its colonel.

38. *New Albany Democrat*, August 24, 1848.

39. *New Albany Democrat*, August 24, 1848.

left and told his men of his brigade that Taylor would make everything right. One reason why he did not do so was Bowles' good story. On the march to Mexico Coloned Bowles told Taylor that the want of efficient drill and discipline in his regiment was due much to his own personal difficulties with General Lane. The trips that he made to Indianapolis to establish his claim to the colonelcy of the Second kept him away from his regiment for some time. According to Bowles this absence was the cause, in a great measure, of the poor drill and his own imperfect knowledge of requirements and customs of the service. No doubt Bowles made out a very good story to the general, for Taylor said, "he appeared in much distress of mind."

He probably shed tears, for a hypocrite can weep. He, the man who had been willing to consign to eternal infamy a whole regiment of men, not one of whom but had a character dear to him as life, itself, appealed to General Taylor, as we must believe from the evidence before us, to save him, the recreant Bowles, the false Bowles, the unprincipled Bowles, from that fate which he so justly deserved, and in his place sacrifice the brave spirits who composed the Second Indiana Regiment; to fasten eternal reproach upon the reputation of the living and the memory of the dead.⁴⁰

There can be little doubt but that, after the court of inquiry and Bowles's failure to make a report, Taylor was certain of the order to retreat having been given. Altho not officially required to do so, he might have saved himself a lot of trouble and Indiana much humiliation had he corrected it. For an explanation of his failure one must look largely to the temperament of the man.

He was firm, proud, prejudiced against volunteers and rather stubborn.⁴² When Lane desired a court martial for Bowles he refused permission and regarded the court of inquiry as an outgrowth of private animosities among the officers. The court, tho regular in procedure knew that it was not looked upon with favor and this is probably the reason that a report of the proceedings was not sent him. Perhaps he regarded the squabbles of the volunteers as too numerous and hopeless to bother with. At any rate he showed an

40. *Ibid.*... This was essentially the opinion of Bowles in Indiana and his later record was not such as to call for a change of opinion.

42. It was later said that he "cussed" them on many occasions.

unreasonable determination to stick to his first statements as made in his official report, regardless of circumstances.

The turmoil over the retreat of the Second Indiana was the most general and intense of the many wrangles that came out of Buena Vista. There was one other, however worthy of attention. That was the little affair over the failure of Taylor to give the Third Indiana due praise. In this case it was not Taylor but General Lane who suffered the blame, for it was to the latter that General Taylor looked for an account of the Third.⁴³

After enumerating the great odds against which the Mississippi regiment fought and very warmly praising it, Taylor added the following concerning the Third Indiana.

The Third Indiana regiment, under Colonel Lane, and a fragment of the Second, under Colonel Bowles, were associated with the Mississippi regiment, during the greater portion of the day, and acquitted themselves creditably in repulsing the attempts of the enemy to break that portion of our line.

The members of the Third became very indignant at thus being "also mentioned" along with the reorganized Second. The regiment played a part second to none in the battle. It had been posted near the pass near Washington's battery and stood the artillery fire until the Second Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois and Mississippi troops had been successively driven back by overwhelming numbers. Twice the Mexicans were driven back in front but when they turned the flanks and took up a position next the mountains the regiment was ordered there and formed a junction with Colonel Davis's regiment and the Second Indiana which had been rallied. This force advanced upon the infantry and lancers and kept up a brisk

43. *Reminiscences of Edward T. Dickey*, Co. G, Third Indiana, *Perry*, 133.

"Much has been said at various times about the part played in the battle of Buena Vista by the Indiana troops. I have never yet seen but one account (and that was written by Colonel James H. Lane, of the Third regiment, and pertained only to the action of his regiment) which appeared to me to have been written by anyone having personal knowledge of the facts; and I have never yet seen the true reason given for the misstatements in the official reports of the battle, as to the Indianians. So far as the Third Regiment was concerned, it grew out of the fact that General Joseph Lane, Brigadier-General of the Indiana Troops, neither called for nor received any report from Colonel Lane of the action of his regiment (the Third), but made report of his *brigade*, when the truth was he had no connection with or command over the Third Regiment at any time during the battle. Where General Lane was during the day of the 23rd of February, 1847, the Third Indiana did not know, for no one who remained in the ranks saw him until after the Mexicans were driven away by the Third Indiana from their slaughter of the Kentuckians and Illinoisians, in the afternoon of that day."

fire until it was ordered to cease by General Taylor. It was then that the lancers made the charge upon the V formation of the Mississippi and two Indiana Regiments. The credit for repelling this charge was generally given the Mississippi regiment. Colonel Lane⁴⁴ said that this charge was made in column upon the extreme right of the Third, the other two regiments being on the left. The lancers were permitted to approach within twenty-five steps of the line before Colonel Lane gave the command to fire. They were repulsed and fled under cover of their battery while the infantry dispersed among the mountains. The Third moved to the vicinity of O'Brien's battery and when it arrived there the Kentucky and Illinois troops, overpowered by numbers, were retreating, with the enemy pressing hotly upon them and the battery, which was in immediate danger of being captured. When the Third opened fire the Mexicans retreated in disorder. This last blow finished the day's work and the Third did not leave the field but bivouacked there in the most advanced position held by the American troops in the morning.

Some of Lane's ambitious enemies even had an elaborate explanation ready as to the exact reason General Lane did not ask for a report from Colonel Lane of the Third. It was because of the feud or "bad blood" existing between these two men.⁴⁵ They had come to blows the Saturday before the battle and shortly afterward General Lane challenged Colonel Lane to a duel which was still pending at the time of the battle. There had been ill feeling between these two men ever since the Third Indiana had left Matamoras ahead of the Second, which was General Lane's favorite regiment. Similar incidents at Camargo and Monterey added to the jealousy.

On the Saturday before Buena Vista, Colonel Lane had drawn up his regiment in a hollow square and he and the other field officers were discussing a plan on the part of the colonel, Adjutant Daily and Captain T. Ware Gibson to continue the Third in the service leaving out Lieutenant-Colonel McCarty and Major Gorman. After the officers had made their statements, General Lane, who had been standing just outside of

44. In letter to the New Orleans, *Delta*, in *Tri-weekly Journal*, June 7, 1847.

45. Letter from "A Taylor Whig." Indianapolis *Tri-weekly Journal*. February 9, 1848.

the lines listening to the discussion, stepped inside and presented his view of the subject. In doing this he said something that Colonel Lane said he did not believe. General Lane replied that "he did not care whether Colonel Lane believed what he said or not. "Colonel Lane's answer was that " a man who did not care what he did say was not likely to care whether what he said was believed." The General asked if the Colonel meant to say that he was a man who disregarded his word. The reply was, "I do, by -----, sir," At this the General struck at him but Colonel Lane dodged and struck his superior in the face. The officers at this time separated the two men. As the general started away he told Colonel Lane to prepare himself. The colonel drew up his men facing the camp and while he was telling them that the trouble was his own and that he wished them to keep out of it, the general was seen coming thru the camp with a rifle on his shoulder. Colonel Lane could not see him. At about thirty yards the general stopped and called "are you ready, Colonel Lane?" The colonel looked around and when he grasped the situation ordered a man in the ranks to load his musket and replied "I ---- can be." Many of the men loaded their miskets. As Colonel Lane was reaching for the gun the guard surrounded the general and took him away. Had the two men exchanged shots the general would likely have killed the colonel and the men of the Third would in all probability have killed the general.⁴⁶ The challenge to a duel followed at once. Such was the extent of the ill feeling between these two men. It was not likely that General Lane would have taken particular pains to commend the Third in his report of the battle.

With such things as these going on among the officers it is easy to see why Indiana's record in the Mexican War was not a brilliant one. The Indiana men made as good soldiers as any in the war but they campaigned and fought under very serious handicaps. Of the four leading officers of the Indiana brigade, one brigadier-general and three colonels, not one was able, when he assumed his duties, to lead a company thru the manual of arms. All of them except Bowles tried to learn, but the colonel of the Second did not have any ambition what-

46. The above account is taken from the *Reminiscences of Edward T. Dickey, Co., G, Third Indiana, Perry, 133.*

ever along this line. His election to the office was very doubtful, yet he had the nerve to hang on. Practically all of the field officers of the Indiana volunteers were the creatures of the politicians. What trained soldiers Indiana had were not elected to places in her regiments. We can hardly blame General Taylor for his reluctance to use the Indiana volunteers. Both he and General Wool knew the facts concerning the manner of officering the regiments. But it was hard on the volunteers to have to suffer for something for which they were in small part to blame.

Recollections of the Campaign of 1856

By Edwin P. Harter, Huntington, Indiana

During this presidential campaign the writer lived at "Slabtown" or Millersburg, now called Collamer. The name of Slabtown was acquired from some of the first huts built there which were made of "slabs" procured from a saw mill that my father operated there at that time. This mill was an "up and down" cut with the saw in a large frame and it cut lumber with a "stump shot" on it and it cut so slowly through the log that the sawyer often went to sleep during the cut.

The campaign of which I write was the one between Fremont and Dayton on the Abolition ticket and Buchanan and Breckinridge on the Democratic ticket for president and vice-president. At that time there were about an equal number of ox teams and horse teams and the abolitionists or Republicans in derision named their ox teams "Buck and Breck". Such teams were driven or guided by the names and the oxen readily responded to them.

Late in the campaign Cassius M. Clay, a nephew of Henry Clay, was billed to make an abolition or Republican speech at Huntington, Indiana. It was rumored that such a speech would not be permitted in Huntington which at that time was strongly Democratic and anti-abolition. This attracted much attention and added largely to the crowd.

Springfield, (now South Whitley), Collamer, Liberty Mills, and North Manchester arranged to "pool" their delegations and fixed on Claysville (which I think is now Bippus) as a meeting place. Each delegation had its own music, consisting of a fifer, a bass drummer and one or more tenor drummers, as bands were unknown at that time in our part of the country.

I recollect that John Summers was our bass drummer and he beat on one end of the drum and then on the top of the drum on the other end and he created an impression in my mind that he was a wonderful musician.

We met at the appointed hour at Claysville and "organized"

by electing Mr. Parker as grand marshal. He was from Liberty Mills and at that town had laid in a liberal supply of plain whiskey which was easy to do owing to the fact that Judge Comstock had located a distillery at that place and the price of whiskey was only 15 cents per gallon, (no tax). Right here I want to deny, not from actual experience, but from observation, the oft repeated statement of the older liberals that the "long ago" whiskey would not make one drunk.

I think it was then that it acquired the name of "40 rod" whiskey, as that distance was the limit that a half pint could be carried on the "inside". I have seen the "swamp angels", come into Collamer on horse back, wearing their red backed jackets or vests, (they were North Carolinians), and in half an hour all be too drunk to get on their horses, after drinking Judge Comstocks whiskey, which was kept in the back room of Bobby Reeds store with a tin cup on the barrel. The whiskey was free to all customers.

It was noted that while Mr. Parker was full he could still ride his horse, owing to long practice under such conditions, and the further fact that his horse seemed to understand the situation and materially aided the rider in retaining his seat. I distinctly recollect the scare he gave me by seeming to go to one side and then straightening up only to go as far to the other side. However, he made the trip without being unhorsed.

When the "delegations" were made into one, it was said to be a mile long. It was composed of over a hundred men and women equally divided on horse back and huge farm wagons, now called "floats". These wagons or floats had from two to twelve horses attached to each with riders on the "head" horses of the wagons with four or more horses. Each delegation had a wagon with a pole twenty-five to thirty feet high guyed to the corners and with the stars and stripes floating from the pole, (there were no telegraph or telephone wires to interfere then).

I most distinctly recollect one wagon with twelve horses that carried twenty-six ladies dressed in white, each one representing one state in the union with the name of the state on a

strip pinned across her shoulder and one lady in black with "bleeding Kansas" on her strip. At that time there were twenty-six states in the union and the territory of Kansas had a miniature war on hand trying to keep it from being admitted as a slave state.

This wagon met with trouble at the Clear Creek hill. The wagons were of the old kind with "linch pin" axles and pine tar for lubricant and the heavy load caused the tar to take fire going up the hill. Water was needed and some thoughtful fellows ran back down to Clear creek and carried water in their hats and put out the fire. The speaking was to occur in a grove on the south side of the river. We crossed the canal near where Washington and Jefferson streets cross on a bridge and we crossed the river below where the Jefferson street bridge now is.

I climbed into the forks of a tree and heard the speech. It was my political baptism. Mr. Clay was six feet tall, straight and fine looking and he looked very impressive to me. The first words I did not hear, as I was on the ground but I was told he took out a document that he said was the constitution of the United States as he might have occasion to refer to it, then he produced a book that he said was the holy Bible and he remarked that he might want to read something in it; then he laid a long old fashioned "horse pistol" in front of him as a paper weight and he said it was for any man that dared to interrupt him. After this occurred, I got in the tree fork and heard all the speech. I distinctly remember him saying you scamps in referring to the democrats and the laws they passed such as the "Fugitive Slave" law, etc.

The meeting was a great success with no disturbance and was attended by large delegations from Wabash, Marion, Ft. Wayne and other small towns, but the campaign was a failure as Fremont and Dayton were defeated and I was almost broken-hearted.

Dr. Edwards of South Whitley and Rev. Hugh Wells of Columbia City both took active part in the campaign. The defeat in this election led up to the glorious victory in the next in which we elected the greatest of all presidents, Abraham Lincoln, whose name and services are now revered by the members of both parties in the north and south alike, altho we had to teach the south that this union could not be divided.

During the time of which this article refers to there were lines of travel designated as "underground" railways through which slaves from the south passed on their way to Canada and freedom. One of the "stations" consisting of a cellar with beds and food was kept at North Manchester, Indiana, by a quaker, Morris Place, by name. Owing to friendly relations between our family and Mr. Place, I learned something of the plan to assist escaping colored men. The line of travel ran near to where we lived and my father was occasionally called on to help those escaping. They travelled by night and slept in the daytime to escape being captured.

It seems strange now that at that time owing to the fugitive slave law it was a crime in Indiana to give a poor man a crust of bread or a drink of water, if he had any negro blood in his veins and was escaping slavery.

The events related in this article were but forerunners to the one big event that was soon to follow when Ft. Sumter was fired upon in April, 1861.

A HISTORY OF INDIANA

From Its Exploration To 1918

In two volumes, 1,120 pages.

BY

LOGAN ESAREY, Ph. D.

Associate Professor of Western History in Indiana University

VOL. I.

- I THE FRENCH IN INDIANA.
- II THE ENGLISH PERIOD, 1764-1779.
- III THE CONQUEST BY VIRGINIA.
- IV CLOSING CAMPAIGNS OF THE REVOLUTION.
- V INDIAN WARS, 1790-1796.
- VI GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY.
- VII INDIANA TERRITORY, 1800-1816.
- VIII INDIANA AND THE WAR OF 1812.
- IX FROM TERRITORY TO STATE.
- X THE STATE GOVERNMENT AT CORYDON, 1816-1825.
- XI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1825-1835.
- XII RELIGION AND EDUCATION IN EARLY INDIANA.
- XIII POLITICS FROM 1825 TO 1840.
- XIV REMOVAL OF THE INDIANS FROM THE STATE.
- XV THE PUBLIC LAND IN INDIANA.
- XVI SYSTEMATIC INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.
- XVII THE SECOND BANK IN INDIANA.
- XVIII THE PIONEERS AND THEIR SOCIAL LIFE.
- XIX THE MEXICAN WAR.
- XX THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1850.
- XXI POLITICS FROM 1840 TO 1852.

VOL. II.

- XXII INDIANA IN THE FIFTIES.
- XXIII CIVIL WAR POLITICS.
- XXIV THE COMMON SCHOOLS.
- XXV BUILDING THE RAILROADS.
- XXVI RECONSTRUCTION.
- XXVIII AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.
- XXIX GREENBACKS AND GRANGERS.
- XXX MINING.
- XXXI STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM.
- XXXII THE TARIFF QUESTION.
- XXXIII THE INDIANA CITIES.
- XXXIV THE COLLEGES.
- XXXV COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENTS.
- XXXVI POPULISTS, SOCIALISTS AND PROGRESSIVES.
- XXXVII MILITARY HISTORY SINCE THE CIVIL WAR.
- XXXVIII LITERARY HISTORY.

"Prof. Logan Esarey, of Indiana University, has written the History of Indiana from its earliest exploration to 1918. No man in the middle west is better equipped to perform this splendid task for the Hoosier commonwealth."

L. N. HINES, *State Supt. Elect.*

PRICE PER SET, POSTPAID \$8.00. SINGLE VOLUME \$4.00

Sent on approval to libraries. Address
all communications to

LOGAN ESAREY,
Bloomington, Indiana.

Rare Books on American and Indiana History for Sale

Terrell's Reports—Indiana in the Civil War, 8 vols.....	\$8.00
Banta, Historical Sketch of Johnson County.....	1.00
Indiana's Roll of Honor, Civil War, Vol. I.....	2.00
The Indiana Soldier—Civil War—2 vols.....	4.00
Streightoff, Indiana, A Social and Economic Survey.....	1.00
Moore, Hoosier Cyclopedia.....	1.00
Wylie, Indiana University 1828-1890.....	1.00
Harding, Indiana University 1828-1904.....	1.00
Dye—Some Torch Bearers of Indiana.....	1.00
Woodburn, Higher Education in Indiana.....	1.00
Clark's Campaign in Illinois—Pirtle.....	1.50
Henry, Political Platforms of Indiana.....	1.00
Moore, History of Hanover College.....	1.00
Young, History of Wayne County.....	1.00
Dunn, Indiana.....	1.00
Howe, The Great West.....	1.00
Legislative and State Manual, set.....	8.00
Woodburn, Hall's New Purchase.....	1.25
Dillon, History of Indiana.....	7.50
Burnet, Notes of the Northwest Territory.....	5.00
Foulke, Life of Morton, 2 vols.....	5.00
Monks, Courts and Lawyers of Indiana, 3 vols.....	15.00
Sweet, Circuit Rider Days in Indiana.....	1.50
Levering, Historic Indiana.....	2.00
Howe, Historical Collections of Ohio, 2 vols.....	3.00
Thayer, Life of John Hay, 2 vols.....	4.00
Strickland, Autobiography of Peter Cartwright.....	1.00
Moore, Life of Schuyler Colfax.....	1.50
Thompson, Stories of Indiana.....	1.00
Shirts, Primitive History of Hamilton County.....	1.50
Eggleston, First of the Hoosiers.....	1.00
Harrison, This Country of Ours.....	1.00
Blaine, Twenty Years of Congress, 2 vols.....	5.00
Dunn, True Indian Stories.....	1.00
Brevier Reports, per vol.....	.50

ADDRESS THIS MAGAZINE

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

CONTENTS

	Page
CHRISTOPHER HARRISON..... <i>Martha Tucker</i>	101
TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT IN INDIANA (Continued)..... <i>Charles E. Canup</i>	112
THE SAVAGE ALLIES OF THE NORTHWEST..... <i>Barce</i>	152

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.00 PER YEAR SINGLE COPY, 50 CENTS

Entered as second-class matter September 16, 1913, at the postoffice at
Bloomington, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Bound Volumes of this Magazine since 1914
can be furnished by the publishers at
\$3.00, postpaid.

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COOPERATION OF

THE INDIANA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

THE INDIANA STATE LIBRARY

BOARD OF EDITORS

JAMES A. WOODBURN, PH.D., Professor of American History
and Politics, Indiana University

SAMUEL B. HARDING, PH.D.,

GEORGE S. COTTMAN, Former Editor, Madison

WILLIAM O. LYNCH, A.M., Professor of History, Indiana State
Normal School

HARLOW LINDLEY, A.M., State Archivist, Professor of History,
Earlham College

JACOB P. DUNN, LL.B., Secretary Indiana Historical Society

DEMARCHUS C. BROWN, A.M., State Librarian

LOGAN ESAREY, PH.D., Managing Editor

Associate Professor of Western History, Indiana University

Subscription Price, \$2.00 per year.

Single Number, 50 Cents.

Address all communications to the MANAGING EDITOR, BLOOMINGTON, IND.

Copyright, 1920, by
Indiana University

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

VOL. XVI

JUNE, 1920

No. 2

Christopher Harrison

MARTHA TUCKER MORRIS, Salem, Indiana.

When the adventurers of the east had settled into well organized homes and cities, the pioneer began to wander to the middle west, and followers of Daniel Boone and George Rogers Clark began to make the history of southern Indiana. Many men breathing the spirit of nature and adventure came to the towns along the Ohio river and pushing further inland the town of Salem began to be a place of importance in the settlement of southern Indiana.

It is the life of one of those early men of whom we write; a peculiar and striking figure with an air of mystery surrounding him, even in the days when in Indiana, wild beasts and rough and ready fights for the survival of the strongest, left little time for mystery.

Christopher Harrison, from 1815 until 1835, perhaps something like twenty years, claimed Salem and the vicinity as his home. It is fitting that a Salemite honor his memory by reviewing the incidents of his life. The subject of this sketch was born in Cambridge, Dorchester county, Maryland, in the year 1775. The family came from England about the middle of the eighteenth century. His father, Robert Harrison, lived and died on a farm called "Appleby" in the suburbs of Cambridge. His son Christopher received a liberal education, being a graduate of St. John's College, Annapolis, Maryland, and receiving also a finishing classical course in Europe. While studying to become a lawyer, he served as confidential clerk to William Patterson, one of the wealthy merchants of Baltimore, and is said to have been also a tutor of Elizabeth Patterson daughter of the merchant.

Slavery was accepted in Maryland, at this time, as part of the social life and Christopher Harrison inherited a number of slaves. An unusual trait of character is shown by him, when he received this inheritance, as he gave these slaves their freedom. Many versions of the romance, connected with the life of Harrison, are given. It is the privilege of the writer to have the telling of this romance from a resident of Salem in the early days, Dr. A. W. King, living in Redlands, California.

I distinctly remember Harrison, as I frequently passed his home—the old Isaac Chase corner—sitting on his porch or under a tree, seemingly enjoying his quiet, solitary life. He was genial and pleasant, but never gushing. You couldn't jolly him as you could D. G. Campbell, Benoni Morris or Colonel Menaugh. He was more of the dignified sort as John I. Morrison, Beebe Booth or John H. Butler. He was rated as a young man of fine social qualities, but an unfortunate love affair, seemed to have revolutionized him in this and made him a misanthrope. He had fallen desperately in love with Miss Elizabeth Patterson, a dashing Baltimore belle and beauty, and things went on swimmingly, till a sprig of royalty in the person of Jerome Bonaparte, crossed their path. The love of a distinguished name, and the prestige it might give her in society, caused Miss Patterson to turn down her humble lawyer for the more brilliant prospect. Harrison was a changed man. He lost all faith in female honesty and constancy and while he never forgot, when in their society, that he was a gentleman, he was ever irresponsible to their attractions and blandishments and tabooed society as much as possible.

Whether this romance was true, or only a romance, we may not know, but something unusual, must have caused a man of his temperament, to leave the comforts of a Maryland community, and seek the life of a pioneer. His name was found engraved on a tree, dated July 8, 1808, and this is supposed to be the beginning of his life in the territory of Indiana. This tree was near his cabin door, the cabin being built on a point called Fair Prospect, probably the present site of Hanover College, and giving a most beautiful view of the Ohio river from the Indiana side.

Maurice Thompson, in his *Stories of Indiana*, says, this cabin was a single room, and that Christopher Harrison lived there for seven years, painting many pictures on the walls, and living the life of a hermit. William W. Woollen in *Historical Sketches of Indiana* tells us he built a kennel for his dogs, back of his cabin, jutting against its chimney of clay, and supported

himself by hunting. He had a knowledge of several languages, and his books formed a part of his life, wherever he went.

However, even in these early days, a hermit began to have neighbors, and in 1809, John Paul was busy establishing his family near the present site of Madison, having purchased large tracts of land in this vicinity, at the public sale of land in Jeffersonville in 1808.

Mr. Paul later named it (the town he founded), Madison, and with the expanding purpose of making it the seat of justice of the newly erected county, he admitted as partners in the project, two Cincinnati pioneers, Lewis Davis and Jonathan Lyon in 1810, and in 1815 Jacob Burnet, also of Cincinnati. * * * In 1811, John Paul and Jonathan Lyon established the first ferry from Madison to the Kentucky shore opposite, at Milton.¹

That Harrison must have met these pioneers and become interested in financial investments of the time is shown from the following:

The territorial legislature sitting in Corydon in 1814 chartered two banks. One of them to be located at Vincennes and the other at Madison. John Paul, founder of Madison, and a hero of the George Rogers Clark campaign, was behind the latter. The capital stock of the Madison bank was to be \$750,000. The Madison bank, called the Farmers and Mechanics was promptly organized by John Paul, John Ritchie, Christopher Harrison, Henry Ristine, N. Hurst and D. Blackmore.²

It may be that this association with the pioneers of Madison explains his friendship for Jonathan Lyon, causing him in 1815 to sell his cabin to George Logan and move to Salem with Mr. Lyon. Salem was at that time one of the most important towns in the territory of Indiana. They brought with them a stock of merchandise and opened one of the first dry goods stores in the town of Salem. Harrison built the first brick house in the town and improved upon his Hanover cabin by building two rooms, one, however, barely large enough for a bed. The lot was 72 by 144 feet, northeast corner of the public square of today and now occupied by the beautiful Salem State bank building and a large brick building, housing the post office of the town.

Harrison in his new home added to his painting and books a garden of flowers and this with a few fine old forest trees made his home the most beautiful in the town. He is said to

¹ *Indiana Magazine of History*, June, 1917, "Colonel John Paul".

² Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 234.

have been very generous with the boys and girls giving them many bouquets of flowers from his garden, and pictures painted by his skillful hands. There is today in Salem, a small trinket box, painted by Christopher Harrison for little Mary Curry, who lived near his home. A colored woman came each morning to care for his home, but older people were not encouraged to visit and he lived almost the life of a recluse, as he had on the banks of the Ohio river.

The first labor in a public capacity, in Salem, by Harrison was the making of three maps of the county, on a scale of one-half inch to the mile, for which service he was allowed by the first board of commissioners, in 1817, the sum of \$15. He was also judge of the Washington county court, for one term, which explains the title bestowed upon him.³

It has been said he made a plat of the town also. The early public records of Washington county show many deeds for lots, to Jonathan Lyon and Harrison, and to Harrison alone. Deed Book B, page 63. Alexander Craig to Christopher Harrison and Jonathan Lyon. Lot 7, Salem, March 18, 1818, probably the purchase of the store building. Deed Book A, page 259. Alexander Craig to Christopher Harrison. Lot 11, Salem, April 11, 1817, is the lot upon which he built his brick home. A very interesting record from Deed Book F, page 129, shows that he still held that all men should be free.

Salem, Washington County and State of Indiana, October 6th, 1830. We certify, that we have known the bearer hereof (a mulatto man, about twenty-four years old, five feet nine inches high, in his stockings, some powder marks in his face, and a small scar on his right arm) from the time he was a small boy, his name is Enoch Delano. The said Enoch Delano, his mother and several small children have resided for many years in this place and have always been considered as free, and as such have never been in any way molested or disturbed. The said Enoch Delano has always conducted himself in a peaceable and orderly manner and we hope and request that he may pass free and unmolested as a free man.

CHRISTOPHER HARRISON,
MICAHA NEWBY,
JOSEPH GREEN,
JOHN CURRY.

³ Stevens, *History of Washington County*.

Another interesting record, showing the confidence of the Salem citizens, in his honesty, and upright character is as follows: Deed Book D, page 293.

Whereas Isaac A. Dennis, about the 4th of April, 1826, left with Christopher Harrison, of Salem, Indiana, for safe keeping, sundry bonds, notes and mortgages, belonging to him, the said Dennis, amounting to about twenty-one or twenty-two hundred dollars, for which the said Harrison gave to said Dennis, his receipt for the same and whereas the said Dennis wishes to receive from said Harrison the papers as left in his care, but has left the said receipt in the state of Rhode Island, now be it known, that I, Isaac A. Dennis, have received and do now acknowledge the receipts and writings and of all papers and writings left in his care, for safe keeping and forever release the said Harrison from all claims for the same and for all claims and demands whatever.

(Signed) ISAAC A. DENNIS.

In presence of John McMahan.

The best description of the personal appearance of Judge Harrison is found in *Biographical and Historical Sketches* by William W. Woollen.

Governor Harrison was a well-built man, of medium height. While he lived in the cabin near where Hanover now is, he was erect in carriage, but later in life, he became bent or stoop-shouldered. He had an oval face, light complexion and blue eyes, says one authority. Another describes him the same, except that his eyes were gray. He was careful of his dress. Usually he was clean shaved and in his person was always scrupulously clean. He was a free-thinker, but he had great respect for the Quaker church. After he returned to Maryland, he frequently extolled the virtues of the Quakers he knew in Indiana. He was a great student, being a voracious reader of books. Judge Banta has a couple of books, one of them printed in Latin, which once belonged to the old pioneer. They contain notes and emendations in his handwriting and interspersed through them are beautiful pictures in water colors, drawn by the deft hand of their owner.

When Judge Harrison had been a citizen of Salem one year the territory of Indiana became a state, and he was elected first lieutenant-governor in 1816, with Jonathan Jennings, as the first governor. The vote cast for lieutenant-governor being 7,474, of which Harrison received 6,570.⁴

The governor and lieutenant-governor were both against slavery in the new state and in many ways were the right men for the highest office the people of Indiana could give in this first year of statehood. It was very unfortunate that condi-

tions arose that caused the lieutenant-governor to appear in a rather unfavorable light.

President Monroe, in 1818, appointed Governor Jennings, General Cass, and Judge Benjamin Parke, a resident of Salem, to negotiate a treaty with the Indians. The constitution of Indiana prohibited the governor of the state from holding any office under the United States, but Governor Jennings, disregarding this, accepted the appointment and wrote to the lieutenant-governor at Salem.⁵

Understanding some official business is necessary to be transacted, permit me to inform you that my absence is still necessary and that it may be necessary for you to attend the seat of government to discharge such duties as devolve on the executive of Indiana. Lieutenant-Governor Harrison thereupon went to Corydon, took possession of the executive office, and performed the duties of governor until Jennings return from St. Mary.

Lieutenant Governor Harrison, we think, very honestly thought that Governor Jennings had vacated the office of governor by this act, and that he should be recognized as acting governor of the state. Governor Jennings felt he was justified in his action by the good accomplished.⁶

In the series of treaties, they succeeded in purchasing from the Indians claim to all the lands in the central part of the state. This was a very important transaction for Indiana and was sufficient excuse, in the opinion of the majority of the people, for the violation of the clause in the constitution which forbids the governor of the state to hold any office under the United States. In order to insure success the contemplated proceedings were kept secret. The negotiations were not protracted and the offense, whatever it may have been, was wholly inadvertent on the part of the governor.

The matter was taken up by the legislature and Jennings recognized as governor. Harrison resigned, sending to the house of representatives the following letter, dated Corydon, December 18, 1818:

I have this day delivered to the Secretary of State, to be filed in his office, my resignation of the office of Lieutenant-Governor of this State. As the officers of the executive department of government and the General Assembly have refused to recognize and acknowledge that authority which, according to my understanding, is constitutionally attached to the office, the name itself, in my estimation, is not worth retaining.

⁵ Esanel, *History of Indiana*, 225.

⁶ Cockrum, *Pioneer History of Indiana*.

The following resolution was passed by the House:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives view the conduct and deportment of Lieutenant-Governor Christopher Harrison as both dignified and correct, during the late investigation of the differences existing in the executive department of this State.

In 1819, at the August election, Lieutenant-Governor Harrison was a candidate for governor, but was defeated. He continued to serve the state in many important commissions and his influence for good was in no way impaired by this experience, but before taking up these commissions, we should like to go back to 1817, and the early days of Masonry in the territory of Indiana and tell of the service of Harrison to Salem and the future state of Indiana. Masonry seems to have been a very essential trait of the character of the early settlers of Indiana, and as soon as possible lodges were organized and meetings held in the cabins. It is to be regretted that the early records of Salem were destroyed by fire and the account of the organization of the Grand Lodge of Indiana, in which Christopher Harrison had a very strong influence, must be given from William Woolen's *Biographical and Historical Sketches*, 494.⁷

The first lodges were organized at Vincennes, Lawrenceburg, Vevay, Rising Sun, Madison, Charlestown, Brookville, Salem and Corydon. These lodges received their dispensations or charters from Ohio or Kentucky. On the 3rd day of December, A. D. 1817, delegates from these various lodges met at the old town of Corydon to make arrangements for organizing a Grand Lodge for the Territory of Indiana. * * * But eleven Masons were present at this meeting. They laid the foundation of the Grand Lodge and what has indeed become a grand body in Indiana. They have all passed to the Grand Lodge above, but their names will ever be commemorated as the founders of Masonry in Indiana. Some of them have children and grandchildren now prominent members of the fraternity. The eleven were General W. Johnston, S. C. Stevens, Abel C. Peper, Christopher Harrison, Henry P. Thornton, Joseph Bartholomew, John Miller, Davis Floyd, Hezekiah B. Hull, James Dill and A. Buckner. * * * In 1826 the Grand Lodge met at Salem, a little town nestled among the hills of Washington County. Thirty-two lodges were represented, covering a territory extending from the Ohio River to the Wabash. Then there was no railroad in the State and no public conveyance between the towns where lodges were located. Some of the delegates rode more than a hundred miles on horseback. We can see in imagination the sturdy yeomen assembled in a log cabin, the grand old primeval forest about them, and the wolves for sentinels. Less than

four hundred Masons were then represented by all the lodges of the State. The records show that the Grand Lodge met at Corydon in 1817, 1821, and 1822; at Madison in 1818, 1819, 1823, and 1824; at Salem in 1825, 1826, 1827, and 1832, at Vincennes in 1831, and there was an adjourned meeting at Charlestown in 1818.

Salem as shown had the meeting, three years in succession, and no doubt because of the enthusiasm of the masons in the community, and this spirit we think, caused largely by the influence of Christopher Harrison in the organization work of the state.

The condition of roads for travel and the necessity of better ways of transacting the rapidly growing interests of the state, brought about the question of building state roads, and in 1818, Christopher Harrison was made the first agent of a state fund called the three per cent fund. This has been explained very clearly in Esarey's *History of Indiana*. 242.

One can scarcely realize the condition of travel in 1825. There was no railroad, no canal, no pike. All the rivers except the Ohio were obstructed by fallen trees, ripples and bars. Two main roads led to Indianapolis, one from Madison, the other from Centerville. The transportation service, if any was to be had, was bad, roads frequently impassable and stages usually late. Two schemes for carrying on internal traffic were early taken up, by the Indiana government. The earliest was the building of state roads, with the three per cent funds. Congress had set aside five per cent of the net proceeds of all the lands sold in Indiana for road building. Three per cent of this was placed at the disposal of the General Assembly, and was known as the three per cent fund. He (Harrison) received the money from the United States and paid it out, according to appropriation by the General Assembly, to the county agent. The county agent used it in opening roads through the forest. Such roads, known as state roads, were one hundred feet wide, but the money was not sufficient to do more than clear them of timber.

During the time that Judge Harrison was agent for this land money, as it was called, Benoni Morris, an early settler of Salem and a Quaker from North Carolina, was commissioned by Harrison to transport a large sum of money from Vincennes to Salem. Morris traveled in a wagon, driven by two stout horses, camping out at night, and delivered the money safely. The money was in boxes so much to the box, but he had no knowledge of the amount entrusted to his care. The money was mostly gold and silver. Jephtha Morris, a boy

at the time, went with his father and the only guard they had was two dogs, not even a gun to defend the costly load.

The site of the capital of the state having been selected, the legislature appointed a commission, January 6, 1821, to lay off the town. This commission was composed of Christopher Harrison, James Jones and Samuel Booker, but when the time came, only Harrison appeared ready for work.⁸

Of the Commissioners elected, Christopher Harrison was the only one to appear at the place on the date fixed upon. Without delay he carried on alone the survey and the sale of lots, a proceeding very properly legalized by an act of the Legislature in November, 1821. Judge Harrison was one of the most interesting characters who ever reached Indiana. He came from Maryland, was possessed of some wealth, had a fine education and a taste for art. * * * Harrison selected Alexander Ralston and Elias Fordham, as surveyors of the new Capital, and Benjamin I. Blythe as clerk to the commissioners. Ralston was a Scotchman, a man of ability, who had been entrusted by Lord Roslin with important engineering work, before coming to this country. He had assisted Major L'Enfant, companion of Lafayette in surveying Washington, the national Capital. It is a well known fact that the design employed by L'Enfant influenced Ralston in his survey of Indianapolis, the scheme involving as it does a circle in the center, with radiating avenues and streets, intersecting at right angles. Fordham the second surveyor, well educated and of a discerning mind, was a member of an ancient family in the east of England. He was a pupil of George Stephenson, inventor of the locomotive steam engine. The association of the men concerned with the beginning of Indianapolis, with those of the far away world, will bear repeating: Harrison with the beautiful Miss Patterson and Jerome Bonaparte; Ralston with Lord Roslin, Aaron Burr, L'Enfant, Lafayette, and Fordham with George Stephenson.

It is interesting to remember also that the subject of this sketch was the one who chose the men so well fitted to plan the capital city of our state. At the sale of the lots, in October, Harrison purchased a number of lots, some of which he held until after he left the state.

Maurice Thompson, in *Stories of Indiana*, tells of Christopher Harrison's last public commission for the state.

In 1824 Christopher Harrison and William Hendricks were appointed to locate a canal around the falls of the Ohio near Jeffersonville. They made their report the following year and filed it on January 18, 1825. * * * Christopher Harrison's connection with the canal scheme ended when he and Governor William Hendricks made their report. After that

⁸ Hodges, *Early Indianapolis*.

he passed out of public life. He moved from Salem to a farm a few miles in the country, where he again took up a lonely life of study and outdoor recreation. He took great interest in growing fine watermelons, and here again, he remembered the children of Salem. He would cut the names of all the boys and girls he knew upon the rinds of as many watermelons; then with his wagon loaded he would enter the town and proceed to distribute his luscious gifts. You may be sure that he was beloved by the young people.

This farm has been difficult to locate, as Lieutenant-Governor Harrison owned several farms near Salem. However it seems probable it was one recorded in Deed Book O, page 64, north of Salem a few miles, and not sold until January 20, 1842, when he was a resident of Talbot county, Maryland. About 1834 or 1835, he left Salem and Indiana and went back to Maryland to live. The Deed Book H, page 192, shows he sold the little brick house in Salem, January 10, 1834.

After Governor Harrison returned to Maryland, he lived among his relatives and friends. For many years he resided with his sister, Mrs. Locherman, and spent his time, when not reading, in hunting and fishing in Chesapeake bay and its estuaries. In letters he says he is "uncle" to all the young folks in the neighborhood. Mr. Williams (a nephew by marriage) says:

—He was a student all his life, and his acquirements were various and extensive. He was not satisfied with a superficial knowledge of anything, he went into matters thoroughly. He was reticent, and it was difficult to get at what he knew or thought on any subject. He was the soul of honor, and no man I ever knew had a more thorough contempt for a mean act. He was generous to excess. He had no love for money or its accumulation. He had opportunities for making a fortune, but he gave away as he made. From the simplicity of the man and his great goodness I became greatly attached to him. He was the best informed man I ever met. At one time he lived in my family for ten years, and I knew him thoroughly. He was an honest man and died poor. He was a remarkable man and deserves a place in history.⁹

And as we near the close of this interesting life, we have from Maurice Thompson a story that takes us back to Salem and gives us his idea of the Maker of the Universe. To a Quaker exercised about the salvation of his soul, Harrison said, "God is love, and love never loses anything; it is infinitely

⁹ Woollen, *Biographical and Historical Sketches*,

forgiving. My soul can not be lost", and Thompson adds: "Perhaps the man was thinking of his own enduring love, by the light of which his whole long life was spent." His life of 88 years ended peacefully at the home of Mr. H. C. Tilghman in Talbot county, Maryland, in 1863.

It is the privilege of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Salem to honor the memory of this man and the influence of his life, for the good of the town of Salem, and the state of Indiana by naming their Chapter the Christopher Harrison Chapter, of Salem, Indiana.

The Temperance Movement in Indiana

By CHARLES E. CANUP, De Pauw University.

(Continued)

THE RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD

After 1875 most of the important work of reconstruction had been accomplished, so conditions became much more satisfactory. Not only this; a steady growth of all institutions has been noted; the educational system had developed; transportation facilities were increasing; and the churches were becoming more efficient. In fact, conditions might be said to have been fairly prosperous, in spite of some severe jolts that came in the form of panics and depressions. In population the state increased from 1,668,000 in 1870 to 1,978,301 in 1880;¹ it had grown enormously in wealth, political prestige and social welfare and in the position it occupied with regard to other states. In the meantime the Methodist church, still one of the foremost temperance forces, had decreased from 113,800 in 1870 to a membership of 106,735 in 1880;² yet, better and more able men were at the head of the institution, and it had become a fairly wealthy organization with property valued at more than three million dollars. Moreover the temperance societies mentioned in previous chapters began to work in earnest, and new ones made their appearance. The influence of these various organizations began to create a public sentiment in favor of temperance. Extracts from the reports of a few of the conventions of these societies will suffice to show what was being done by them at that time.

Sometime during the year of 1870 the Indiana Temperance Alliance met with all of the districts of the state represented but two. In the evening a mass meeting was held at which addresses were made by the Rev. J. H. Clippenger, Methodist

¹ *Census Report for 1880.*

² This does not include probationers and local preachers; these numbered about 7,500.

minister; later Col. Ray was elected president for the coming year and the following resolutions were adopted:

1. *Resolved:* That we have renewed faith in the principles proclaimed in our last annual meeting, that the experience of the last year has tended more and more to confirm us in the belief that there is no human agency short of total abstinence which can save our country from becoming a nation of drunkards; that it is the first duty of the temperance men to discourage by precept and example the use of all kinds of fermented as well as distilled liquors; that the young should be carefully educated to abhor and wholly abstain from its use; and that our efforts should never cease for the reformation of the drunkard.

2. *Resolved:* That believing the time-honored maxim 'that prevention is better than cure' applies with peculiar force to the cause of temperance, we recommend as one of the most effectual means for spreading our principles; that there be a more general and more thorough advocacy of them in the Sabbath and common schools and the establishment of juvenile temperance organizations.

3. *Resolved:* That in order to facilitate the above teaching there is a demand for a primary text book on physiology which shall present more fully than any primary work extant the nature of alcohol and its evil effects on the human system.

4. *Resolved:* That R. T. Brown, who suggested such a book be requested to complete it at the earliest practicable period.

5. *Resolved:* That the success which has attended the efforts of our general agent during the past year confirm us in the conviction that if we expect our cause to succeed we must maintain a continual agitation on the subject by an increase of traveling agents and a more thorough distribution of temperance literature. We also recommend that space be obtained in some respectable newspaper in each county throughout the state for the purpose of advocating our cause and disseminating our principles.

6. *Resolved:* That as woman has ever been the faithful supporter of every movement for the elevation and advancement of mankind and believing that our efforts cannot be successful without her influence we earnestly ask her co-operation in this great work, especially among the young and the rising generation.

7. *Resolved:* That while we have the highest respect for the ability and character of the medical profession we cannot close our eyes to the sad fact that a large amount of intemperance is generated by the indiscriminate prescription of alcoholic liquors as medicine and believing that the advanced state of medical and chemical science has recently demonstrated that many cases of disease for which alcohol had been administered can more easily be cured without its use, and respectfully ask that honored profession to give this important matter their earnest and conscientious consideration.

8. *Resolved:* That while we favor and will earnestly work for a law prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquors we do hereby agree to

use the utmost endeavors to prevent the obtaining of license under and bringing to punishment offenders of the existing law.

9. *Resolved:* That we believe the principle of licensing the traffic in intoxicating liquors is the principle of legalizing a wrong, is opposed to the enlightened moral and religious ideal of the people of the country and should be scouted by all lovers of temperance.

10. *Resolved:* That Col. J. W. Ray, Sylvester Johnson, and D. R. Pershing be appointed a committee to represent the alliance before the next legislature and use their effort to secure the enactment of a prohibitory law.

11. *Resolved:* That the *Western Independence* is the only temperance paper in the state and we believe it our duty to encourage its circulation throughout the state.

12. *Resolved:* That we recommend the temperance people throughout the state to hold meetings as suggested by the Congressional Temperance Society of Washington during last February.³

In addition to these resolutions there were hundreds of others offered up by the same and other organizations in the interest of better temperance education. Every year brought forth something new in the line of temperance arguments.

Early in the spring of 1874 another movement began at Chatauqua, Ohio, that was destined to have far-reaching results. It sprang from the Woman's Crusade of 1873. This small group of women finally met in Cleveland late in the fall of the above year and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union took form; it is sometimes known as the white ribbon movement. Its object was to unite the efforts of Christian women for the extinction of intemperance. In their own words their purpose was set forth as follows:

Resolved: That whereas the object of just government is to conserve the best interests of the governed; and, whereas the liquor traffic is not only a crime against God, but subversive of every interest of society; therefore, in behalf of humanity, we call for such legislation as shall secure this end; and while we will continue to employ all moral agencies as indispensable, we hold prohibition to be essential to the full triumph of this reform.⁴

³ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1870, 41.

⁴ *Origin of Woman's Temperance Crusade*. Pamphlet of four pages. *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*, 651. The celebration of the second anniversary of the W. C. T. U. resulting from the crusade movement was held at Philip's Hall, Richmond, Indiana, February 23. *Western Christian Advocate*, 1876, 69.

Sometime later at one of their conventions held in Chicago during the year 1877 a pledge was adopted. It was as follows:

I hereby solemnly promise, God helping me, to abstain from all distilled, fermented and malt liquors, including wine, beer, and cider, and to employ all proper means to discourage the use of the traffic in the same.⁵

In addition to this each member was supposed to wear a white ribbon as a badge and have for their motto "For God and Home and Native Land".⁶ Their numbers increased rapidly and soon Indiana was pretty well organized. Practically all of the earnest members of the various churches soon became affiliated with the movement. Particularly has this been true of the Methodist church, because of their well known temperance principles.

As a result of the W. C. T. U. work in other fields a great many of their local societies sprang almost spontaneously into existence. In northern Indiana a Ladies Temperance convention composed of over two hundred and fifty delegates from twenty-two counties met at Fort Wayne during May of 1874, and passed the following resolutions:

Resolved: That while we depend on religion and moral sentiment making our appeal to God and humanity, as the grand elements of power in advancing the cause of temperance, we claim the protection of the law against pauperism and crime which results from drunkenness and the help of the law in restraining and repressing the liquor traffic which is the prolific cause of intemperance.

Resolved: That the 'Baxter Law' (passed in 1873) shall be maintained subject only to such modifications as experience may suggest to render it more efficient.

Resolved: That while we disclaim any purpose of entering the field of party politics to help or hinder any party in its especial ends we shall demand of all parties the election of sober men to office; and we declare our purpose to use all our influence, religious, social, and political, in support of these men who are in favor of personal sobriety and effective temperance legislation.⁷

Two years later the third annual mass State Temperance convention was held at the Baptist church in Indianapolis. All temperance men and women of the state were invited to attend; all churches, sabbath schools, Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, and all other temperance organizations, juve-

⁵ *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*, 651. Also Report of W. C. T. U. of Indiana containing Constitution any year.

⁶ *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*, 651.

⁷ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1874, 173.

nile and young folks' Temperance Unions, and all Young Men's Christian Associations. Reduced railway fare might be had from any part of the state. Some of the prominent speakers were Frances E. Willard and William Baxter.⁸ The following year a similar meeting was held.⁹ Much sentiment was aroused. Prominent among the effective agencies in the good work in our state was the W. C. T. U.¹⁰

As a result of the sentiment aroused among the women, some exciting things took place throughout the state. At Greencastle the ladies had been picketing the saloons for five weeks. They had to sit out of doors most of the time. In the end, however, many indictments were found against the liquor dealers; and some of them actually had to close up.¹¹ Of the dozen saloons in Crawfordsville, one surrendered during April, 1874 and the women were greatly encouraged. At Bloomington the ladies stood guard from six o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock at night. This was to enforce the Baxter law. At Ellettsville, they so enforced the law that no one in town used whiskey or other intoxicants.¹²

At Shelbyville the movement was spontaneous. A few women in the Methodist church appointed a mother's prayer meeting where they met and prayed over the situation. Then they resolved to visit the tippling houses, which they did. They were so much horrified at what they saw that they began to sing and pray. It had quite a noticeable effect. The outgrowth of this was the formation of a County Temperance Alliance, destined to continue for twenty years. Articles of association were drawn up, a committee appointed to solicit stock, and a mass meeting appointed to be held at the Methodist church. After that the women met daily at the Methodist church to pray against the traffic.¹³ At Mt. Vernon, the saloons were soon reduced from twenty-two to nine, and later from that to five, and these were in a dying condition as a result of the efforts of the church women of the place. The

⁸ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1876, 124.

⁹ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 405.

¹⁰ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1882, 177.

¹¹ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1874, 157.

¹² *Western Christian Advocate*, 1874, 109.

¹³ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1874, 61.

same was true at New Harmony, Poseyville, Princeton, Evansville, etc.¹⁴

Still another movement, known as the red ribbon movement, also spread rapidly over the United States at about the same time. Doctor Henry A. Reynolds, of Bangor, Maine, adopted in 1874 the red ribbon as the badge of the reform club of that place. The club, which for the most part consisted of reformed drinking men, had been organized but a short time before this. It was probably the first club of its kind ever formed. In addition to the red ribbon they also made use of the white ribbon to be worn by the women members and the boys under eighteen years of age. The movement became popular and spread rapidly to other states, so that before long it was mentioned as having organizations in Indiana.¹⁵

By June of 1877 the movement had struck the Quaker town of North Manchester and ninety-six signed the pledge on the first evening. It was so successful that a second meeting was announced.¹⁶ At LaGrange the movement was inaugurated by Cassiday and Hollenbeck. It was very successful and by July 6 something over seven hundred had signed the pledge. At Evansville the movement struck with equal force. Drinkers donned the red ribbon and became active temperance workers.¹⁷ The Indianapolis *Journal* speaks of the movement having reached them; over eight hundred had signed the pledge by the middle of July. However, there were still eleven saloons left there who complained of hard times. Public sentiment was improving; drunkards diminishing. In Madison county success accompanied the movement; Union county reported twenty-five hundred signers; Fayette, four thousand and Franklin two thousand. At Connersville a temperance picnic was held which was attended by a crowd of about eight thousand.¹⁸ In New Albany the red ribbon movement had become permanent by the end of the year; by 1878

¹⁴ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1874, 133. (This paper seems to be more authoritative and comprehensive than any other paper consequently it is oftenest cited as a reference.

¹⁵ *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Reform*, 57.

¹⁶ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 189.

¹⁷ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 221.

¹⁸ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 253.

Evansville boasted of ten thousand signers of the pledge; here a Mrs. Saleta Evans presented the Red Ribbon Club with a lot valued at \$10,000 for the erection of a public hall.¹⁹ With the movement extending in this manner throughout the state, aided by the church men, particularly the Methodists, their influence was considerably felt in the way of a creation of public sentiment in favor of temperance everywhere.

Next in these ribbon crusades came the blue ribbon movement, sometimes known as the Murphy movement. Perhaps, the blue ribbon has been associated with temperance reform more than any other badge. It was adopted by Francis Murphy and has since been donned by thousands in this country who have been induced to sign the pledge. The idea seems to have been borrowed from England where their organization had started in 1873. In a short time more than a million pledge cards had been issued in addition to the cards given out by the independent individual workers. After a time there was a change in the name from the Blue-Ribbon army to the Blue-Ribbon Gospel temperance movement. Since then several branch organizations have been organized within the society; such as, the Help-Myself Society among the men and the Help-One-Another Society, among the women.²⁰

The movement had hardly started before it began to spread throughout the United States. It was introduced at Madison during the first part of June, 1877. A meeting was held at the court house there and twenty-two signed the pledge.²¹ The *Madison Independent Courier* says that the Murphy movement was introduced at Vevay about the same time under the leadership of the Reverend W. W. Snyder; forty-eight persons signed the pledge. A dispatch to the Cincinnati *Commercial* dated Cambridge City, June 10, says: "The Murphy struck Cambridge City today. About five hundred have signed the pledge amid enthusiasm." At Aurora one thousand signatures

¹⁹ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1878, 69.

²⁰ *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Reform*, 57.

²¹ *Madison Courier*, June 6, 1877. At the meeting of the North Madison Temperance organization Tuesday evening, twenty-four new names were added to the pledge. A red ribbon for the gentleman and a blue one for the ladies were adopted as badges of the organization. A petition bearing one hundred and fifty names was placed in the hands of a committee to be presented to the county commissioners asking them not to grant Mr. Henderson a license to sell liquor in North Madison. *Madison Courier*, June 8, 1877.

to the Murphy pledge were obtained. Patriot was perfectly revolutionized by the movement. Here it was led by Reverend D. A. Robertson, of Patriot circuit, assisted by workers from Rising Sun; in Jonesboro nine hundred and ten signed the pledge in one week; this comprised about nine-tenths of the drinking people, many of whom had been hard drinkers. The saloon keepers began to feel quite blue. At Rising Sun the movement was inaugurated in the Methodist church by T. H. Bonham of Elizabethtown, assisted by other pastors; two hundred and three persons signed the pledge. In Richmond the Methodist pastors, Reverend A. Marine and R. H. Sparks as well as others were conspicuously active in this movement. Meetings were held in the Lyceum hall, the largest room in the city. It was crowded every night. For three weeks this continued. At the end of that time about five thousand had signed the pledge.²²

At Princeton the movement struck with wonderful success, over sixteen hundred signing the pledge; at Portland drunkards reformed by the hundreds; at Covington the same thing was true;²³ at Potaka the Methodists inaugurated the movement, seventy-five being enrolled upon the temperance banner.²⁴ Marion signed six hundred in two nights, ninety percent of which remained true to their pledge; at Greenfield the pastor of the Methodist church threw himself body and soul into the work; the same is true of the pastor of Dillsboro.²⁵ Blue ribbons became quite numerous in Greencastle, led on by Doctor Conway, a reformed drunkard physician.²⁶

All during 1877 the movement continued over the state and in the following year. Randolph county was thoroughly aroused. The Methodist pastor of Edinburg reports from forty to seventy-five names weekly as pledges.²⁷ At Washington over fifteen hundred had taken the Murphy pledge;²⁸ over eighteen hundred had signed in Bluffton and over four

²² *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 205.

²³ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, p. 213.

²⁴ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 221.

²⁵ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 237.

²⁶ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 253.

²⁷ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1877, 77.

²⁸ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1878, 85.

thousand in Wells county at the end of the first three weeks;²⁹ Shelby county under the leadership of the Blue Ribbon organization, had a grand temperance revival, five thousand persons in the county signing. Great improvement in the crowds that assembled in Shelbyville on Saturday and Sunday was noticed.³⁰ And so the thing grew until near the end of 1879 it was reported that there were eighty-five local unions in the state in good working order.³¹

It has undoubtedly been one of the big temperance forces in the state and there is no question but that the major portion of the members were also members of some church.

Besides these mentioned there was the Union Temperance organization of Indiana. This met and organized in Indianapolis on May 24, 1878. The Indiana State Christian Temperance Union organized about the same time, and the Grand Council of Temperance. The latter came into existence on November 19, 1879. The object of the organization was to unite the different temperance organizations of the state for the purpose of concerted action. In their constitution provision was made for all temperance societies of the state to form the Union, without, however, each losing its distinctive feature. The Constitution, which was subsequently adopted was as follows:

In order to form an alliance, insure harmony, secure concert of action, and promote the causes of temperance, we the representatives of the different temperance organizations in the state of Indiana, grateful for the helping hand of Almighty God, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

Article I. All powers herein granted shall be vested in a council to be known as the Grand Temperance Council of the State of Indiana.

Section 2. The Grand Council shall be composed of delegates to be chosen every year by the several organizations in the state, each to be entitled to such representation as may from time to time be fixed by the council.

Article II. At each annual meeting of the council there shall be appointed an executive committee of five. Such a committee shall have general superintendence over the work throughout the state, shall decide upon the statistics to be reported to the Grand Council, make all neces-

²⁹ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1878, 93. Mention is made in the *Greencastle Banner*, *Madison Courier* and others in a more general way than here. The *Western Christian Advocate* seems to be a good summary of the movement.

³⁰ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1878, 77.

³¹ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1879, 373.

sary arrangements in reference to the annual holdings of the meeting of the council. They shall fill all vacancies in office occurring during the year and all money shall be paid out under the direction of such committee.

Section 3. The corresponding secretary shall devote all the time necessary to the discharge of the duties of the office, and shall receive such salary as the council shall from time to time fix and determine.

Section 4. The president and other officers shall perform the duties that usually pertain to such offices.

Section 5. At every meeting of the council there shall be appointed a committee of five in each congressional district in the state, who shall assist the executive committee in organizing and prosecuting the work; and shall appoint such sub-committees of three in each county in their respective districts. Through such district committees the county committees shall report the condition of the work in their respective counties, quarterly to the executive committee.

Article III. All the various organizations shall remain intact, retaining their distinctive features, and the council shall in no way interfere with nor change the manner of prosecuting their work.

Article IV. The Grand Council shall from time to time adopt such by-laws as may be deemed proper, the same not to be inconsistent with this constitution.

Article V. The Grand Council, whenever two-thirds of the members present shall deem it necessary, may make amendments to this constitution which shall be valid and to all intent and purposes become a part of the same.³²

As the Grand Council grew in organization more work was done; a state central temperance literature bureau was formed with Miss Aurette Hoyt as secretary; days of prayer were inaugurated; christian and temperance people all over the state were urged to attend the session of the legislature in 1881; a prohibitory amendment to the constitution was asked for and men and women were urged to write to their representatives. In their own words:

The Grand Temperance Council has come to stay. It is permanently established, and we shall keep it until we win, no matter how long it takes. In addition we count on the whole moral and religious force of the state to help us.³³

First, gospel temperance meetings are to be held as often as practicable in all the churches.

³² *Western Christian Advocate*, 1879, 382. Also Constitution in Minutes and the Proceedings of the Grand Council.

³³ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1881, 20.

Besides this an earnest appeal was made to the clergy and churches of the state. It was as follows:

Second, that there be co-operation with county councils wherever they exist, in securing addresses and sermons and gospel temperance meetings for all possible points of the country; and we also ask that you use your personal efforts in securing an organization of the temperance forces of your county into a county temperance council.

Third, that we ask a pledge from the members of our respective churches to support prohibition.³⁴

By 1881, their work had become so great that the Cincinnati *Enquirer* said of them:

The temperance people of Indiana have hit upon a new method of organization, which is not only unique, but promises to be very effective in giving strength for the prohibitionists from all political parties. The Grand Temperance council is making up a state central committee of one man from each political party in every county. Their object is not to organize independent political action but to keep the prohibition movement outside of parties and unite the full temperance strength of each party in the interest of candidates pledged to refer the prohibitory constitutional amendment to the people.

In addition to this the Methodists of the state proposed to hold an Indiana Methodist Episcopal conference for temperance. This was to prepare the public mind for the issue in the fall of 1881.³⁵

At about the same time that the ribbon movements were under way, the lodges began to work along the same lines. As early as 1874 the grand lodge of the Odd Fellows of Indiana took action on the subject of temperance. The grand master, Richard Owen of the State University, made a report against it; and on the same day the grand lodge issued the following resolution against it by a vote of four hundred and fifty to one.

Inasmuch as our order is placed, in many locations, in a false position on the question of temperance, and erroneous views are entertained by parties outside of our order on our position as Odd Fellows; therefore,

Resolved: That our grand representative to the grand lodge of the United States be instructed to urge upon that body the passage of the law prohibiting lodges from receiving into their membership any person engaged in the manufacture or sale of spirituous or malt liquors and that they be requested to use their best endeavors to induce those who are engaged to relinquish the traffic in these articles. The influence of

³⁴ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1881, 245. Report of the Minutes and Proceedings of the Grand Council.

³⁵ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1881, 133.

this action will be felt in every portion of Indiana where 24,778 members of the fraternity are now found.³⁶

The Odd Fellows were followed shortly by the Masons and various other lodges all of which lent their quota of influence to the movement. Add to all of these movements the Children's temperance movement begun at New Albany in 1879;³⁷ temperance camp meetings held in various parts of the state such as Vincennes, Lafayette, Columbus, Muncie and Ligonier;³⁸ and the thousands of petitions beginning to pour into the legislative halls and an idea may be gathered concerning the growing temperance sentiment throughout the state.³⁹ The time seemed ripe for more legislation.

As a result of the beginning of these various agitations, an act was passed on February 27, 1873, which made it unlawful to sell, or give away for the purpose of gain any intoxicating liquors to be drunk about the premises without first obtaining a permit from the county commissioners. The applicant for such a license had to file with the auditor, not less than twenty days before the meeting of the board, a petition in writing giving the exact location, also certifying that the said applicant was a voter in the county, and that he was a proper person to have such a permit. This application had to be signed by a majority of the legal voters resident in the ward, town or township. If the petition was according to law and in regular form then the applicant had to pay the expense of filing such petition and give a bond of three thousand dollars with freehold security to insure payment of all fines and costs and all damages which might result from the selling of liquors by him. These licenses were all for one year; and the man was required to keep a certificate in a conspicuous place showing when his permit expired. If this permit was violated

³⁶ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1874, 182.

³⁷ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1879, 139.

³⁸ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1882, 5.

³⁹ The *Greencastle Banner* says 40,000 petitions. Petitions 1883 to submit amendments. Signatures aggregated 24,755 from 85 counties. Petitions placed in Senate, 9,957. To Republican senators, 4,283; Democratic senators, 5,674. Petitions placed in House, 14,798. To Republican representatives, 7,521; Democratic, 7,277. Total petitions to Republican members, 11,804; Democratic, 13,951. Thousands more were to follow. The clerk was going to have a barrel ready to hold the vast pile of manuscripts which were coming in asking to have either the temperance or suffrage amendments submitted. *Madison Weekly Courier*, Jan. 24, 1883.

in any manner the holder must forfeit it and no new license might be granted him for a period of five years. In addition to this he was not allowed to sell liquors to minors or intoxicated persons, or persons in the habit of becoming intoxicated. Moreover, no liquors might be sold on Christmas, Thanksgiving Day or any public holiday between the hours of nine p. m. and six a. m. Other minor provisions were made as well as provisions for adequate penalties for the violation of any or all parts of the act.⁴⁰ This act is sometimes known as the "Baxter Law". A local act was also passed authorizing the city of Huntington to charge a license fee of not less than twenty-five nor more than five hundred dollars.⁴¹

In the meantime, as noted above, the agitation became greater and greater. As a direct outgrowth of this two more laws were passed in 1875. The first of these provided that any person holding office under the constitution or laws of this state who shall voluntarily become intoxicated within the business hours of his office, or shall be in the habit of becoming intoxicated, shall forfeit his office, and be removed therefrom upon complaint and conviction filed by any citizen of the state.⁴²

In the second place another act was passed which provided that no person should sell any spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors in less quantities than one quart without a license, nor shall any persons without a license sell any intoxicating liquors to be drank about his premises. To obtain such a license the applicant had to give twenty days' notice in some newspaper, or three most prominent places in case there be no newspaper, before the meeting of the board, describing the precise location where he intended to keep shop. Any voter, then, of the township might remonstrate in writing on account of the immorality or other unfitness of the applicant. The license for such sale of liquor was to cost one hundred dollars in addition to which the man was required to give bond in the sum of two thousand dollars conditioned to keep an orderly and peaceable

⁴⁰ *Laws of Indiana*, 1873, 151-8.

⁴¹ *Laws of Indiana*, 1873, 149.

⁴² *Laws of Indiana*, 1875, 91.

house and to pay all fines. Such licenses were good for one year.⁴³

Some of the provisions of the law were that no licensed person was to sell on Sunday or any legal holiday, or on election day, or between eleven p. m. and five a. m. under penalty of not less than ten dollars or more than fifty for the first conviction; for the second he had to forfeit his license. Neither was he permitted to sell to persons in the habit of becoming drunk; nor to any person after notice had been given to him by the wife, child, parent, brother, or sister, or township trustee under penalty of from ten to fifty dollars. Other minor provisions were included such as penalties for getting drunk, for adulterating liquors, and for keeping disorderly places. All former laws for regulating the sale of liquors and all parts of laws conflicting with these are repealed and an emergency declared.⁴⁴

But legislation did not follow closely upon the heels of the various movements in the state for only minor provisions in 1877 were passed. They made it unlawful to sell on Sunday, Fourth of July, New Years day, Christmas, Thanksgiving or any election days under penalty of not less than ten nor more than fifty dollars, to which might be added imprisonment not to exceed sixty days. Moreover, no druggist or druggist's clerk should sell on those days, except on a written prescription of some regular practicing physician under penalty of not less than five nor more than one hundred dollars to which might also be added imprisonment not to exceed sixty days.⁴⁵

During the same year another act was passed which authorized any incorporated towns to license the sale of spirituous, vinous, malt and other intoxicating liquors at a sum not exceeding the price charged by the state. The wording of this law was slightly changed in 1879 but the context remained the same.⁴⁶

The agitation by this time had become quite intense; thousands of memorials and resolutions were being offered yearly to the legislature; and petitions were introduced into the

⁴³ Cities and incorporated towns might charge one hundred dollars in addition to these provisions. Vinous and malt liquor licenses cost only fifty dollars.

⁴⁴ *Laws of Indiana*, Special Session 1875, 55-59.

⁴⁵ *Laws of Indiana*, 1877, 92-3.

⁴⁶ *Laws of Indiana*, 1879, 144-5.

Senate, January 18, 1881, through the members of the counties sending them. They aggregated 12,336 signatures, all legal voters duly attested and representing fifty-nine counties.⁴⁷ It created a greater sensation than any ordinary routine business since the beginning of the session. The petitions were signed by all classes. Accordingly the members of the legislature of 1881 deemed it wise to take a greater step than they had since the days of 1855. A few minor acts were passed at the same time that the more important legislation was going on. One of these provided that whoever holding an office under the constitution or laws of the state became intoxicated during the business hours of his office should be fined from ten to one hundred dollars, to which might be added imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed ten days, and for the second offense he might be deprived of his office by judgment of the proper court.⁴⁸

Another of these acts passed the same year provided penalties for drunkenness, selling to a man who was drunk, or who was known habitually to get drunk, selling to a minor, furnishing intoxicants to a prisoner, selling on Sunday or legal holidays, or between the hours of eleven p. m. at night and five a. m. in the morning, selling liquor within one mile of religious or agricultural meetings except at the regular places of business. Druggists were also prohibited from selling in any quantities on Sunday, July Fourth, New Years day, Christmas, Thanksgiving or other legal holiday and on any election day. The penalties ranged from ten to one hundred dollars fine and imprisonment not to exceed sixty days.⁴⁹

The same legislature under stress of petitions sent them by teachers, professors, attorneys, physicians, and college presidents proposed to submit the following amendment to the people of the state after it should have again been passed by the legislature of 1883.⁵⁰ It was a joint resolution originating in the House and read as follows:

Section 1. The manufacture, sale, or keeping for sale in said state, spirituous, vinous, malt or any other intoxicating liquors except for

⁴⁷ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1881, 29.

⁴⁸ *Acts of Regular and Special Sessions*, 1881, 204.

⁴⁹ *Acts of Regular and Special Sessions*, 1881, 214-16.

⁵⁰ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1881, 29.

medical, scientific, mechanical and wines for sacramental purposes shall be and is hereby forever prohibited in the State of Indiana.

Section 2. The General Assembly of the State of Indiana shall provide by law in what manner, by whom, and at what places such liquors shall be manufactured or sold for medical, scientific, mechanical and sacramental purposes.⁵¹

The agitation during the next two years was perhaps the greatest in the history of the state. Led by the four conferences of Methodism in the state the forces of temperance put up a gallant fight. The temperance report of the church in 1881 was as follows:

Whereas the legislature of the state of Indiana at its last session took the initial steps looking to the submission of an amendment to the constitution of the state prohibiting the manufacturing or sale of liquors to be used as a beverage; and, whereas the next legislature will have to pass upon the subject before it can be submitted to a vote of the people; therefore

Resolved: That we pledge ourselves with the temperance people of the state to use our influence and votes to defeat any candidate for the legislature of the state who will not pledge himself and his vote in favor of submitting this question to a vote of the people.⁵²

This was followed by a much stronger one in 1882. It read:

Resolved: That a refusal on the part of the legislature to submit this question to a vote of the people would be subversive of their rights as guaranteed by our constitution and by the genius of our government.

Resolved: That we claim and demand the right to pass upon this amendment at a special election, when the question can be separated from all political and personal complications.

Resolved: That we will support no man, or any political party, for the legislature, who will not in advance pledge himself to vote for this amendment and for its submission to the people.

Resolved: That we will banish all fermented wines from our sacramental tables.

Resolved: That we will heartily co-operate with all legitimate political or temperance organizations that are seeking to establish constitutional prohibition.⁵³

In spite of these resolutions and pledges of the Methodists, the forty thousand petitions of the people to the legislature asking for the amendment,⁵⁴ and the ardent work of all the

⁵¹ *Acts of Regular and Special Sessions*, 1881, 720-21.

⁵² *Northwest Indiana Conference Minutes*, 1881, 52.

⁵³ *Northwest Indiana Conference Minutes*, 1882, 52-3.

⁵⁴ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1883, 37.

temperance societies, the amendment failed to come up before the people and the forces of right were again defeated. The story of how they were defeated is told in another chapter on temperance agitation and constitutional growth.

Again the forces of intemperance had won. Summarizing the outstanding features of the work during the period we find, in the first place, a period of depression following their defeat in 1855; next the period of great laxity due to the demoralization of the temperance forces, the slavery agitation, the Civil war, and then the reconstruction period. These years are characterized by the lack of temperance societies, lack of interest on the part of the churches and almost utter disregard of the problem by the legislature. After this came the growing sentiment as shown by the great number of societies, church work, and an increased agitation in the legislative halls. Of the many temperance workers of the time perhaps Thomas A. Goodwin and Colonel Ray deserve especial mention.

THE PERIOD OF VICTORY

Just as a period of depression followed the defeat of the temperance forces in 1855 so a similar period followed their defeat in 1883. However, in the latter there was no Civil war or other great national crisis to accentuate this depression. Consequently it did not become nearly so great as during the earlier period.

In the meantime the country continued in its prosperity. The population in Indiana increased from 1,978,301 in 1880 to 2,192,404 in 1890; from that to 2,516,462 in 1900; and to 2,700,876 in 1910;¹ and, doubtless at the time of complete victory, had reached the three million mark. Means of communication multiplied. The old postal system and isolated telephone were supplemented by multiplied telegraph lines and rural mail delivery; a rejuvenated civil service with express and parcels post came into existence; ways of transportation increased from the few trains, buggies and wagons to countless railroad and interurban lines, and thousands of automobiles; from the little country school house we progressed to consolidation and centralization, to a systematized high school

¹ *Statistics for Indiana, Bureau of Census, 568.*

and numerous universities—all devoted to the education of the young; industry likewise grew by leaps and bounds. With the development of all of these phases of life has come a slow and steady development of the machinery of government as well as other institutions, such as the churches. The latter have hardly kept pace with the others, but nevertheless they have made their presence felt.

The churches continued to be among the most potent temperance forces in the state. Because of their traditions they were impelled to even greater efforts than any time in their previous history. And because of the great increase in their membership and wealth they were better qualified to do more. From a church of 106,735 members in 1880, the Methodists as representative of the general church movement, grew until they reached the mark of 141,693 in 1890—a percentage of six and nine-tenths of the entire population; from that to 178,676 in 1900, a percentage of seven and six-tenths of the whole and from that to 208,655 in 1910, a percentage of eight and two-tenths; and, by 1915 just two years before the ultimate victory they numbered 240,084, about one-third the entire church membership in the state. Add to this the growth of public moral sentiment due to their efforts and the expansion of the church temporal welfare and a fair conception of their importance can be gained. In 1880 the Methodists had property valued at about only \$3,000,000; in 1890 that had multiplied to \$3,760,950 while their parsonages had grown in value to \$454,405, making a total of \$4,214,355; by 1900 it had further increased to about \$4,902,415 for the churches and for the parsonages about \$700,000, making in all about \$5,600,000; and, by 1910 the value of the churches was placed at \$7,811,960 and the parsonages \$1,172,565 totaling about \$9,000,000. By the year 1917 they were both valued at more than \$12,000,000.²

The other churches increased in like manner. By 1906 the Baptists in the state numbered 92,705; the Christian church, 118,447; the Lutherans, 55,768; the Presbyterians, 58,633; Roman Catholics, 174,347; United Brethren, 52,700; the German Evangelical Synod, 21,624; Episcopalian, 7,653 and all

² These statistics were taken from the various reports of the Indiana Conferences. A few are missing so an estimate had to be made.

other denominations 102,249.³ Besides this their wealth had increased until the total for all the churches was \$31,081,500. With still other institutions like these fighting all of the various liquor organizations need it be necessary to say that much work was done during this period for the betterment of the people of the state?

Along with the growth of the churches came the development of the various other temperance organizations, largely a result of the influence emanating from the former. The various organizations beginning previous to the eighties continued their work, many of them increased greatly for a time and a few new ones began operations, while some died out entirely.

To aid further temperance work the Methodist church organized within itself a temperance society. This did not take place until 1908 and consequently its influence has been exerted only in comparatively recent years. The purpose of the society was to spread the doctrine of temperance throughout the church, promote voluntary abstinence from intoxicating liquors among the people connected with the church, and raise money for the assistance of the temperance cause. Money did not begin to make its appearance, however, until 1912. Following is a table showing the entire amount contributed by the church for that cause.

N. W.				
Year.	Ind. Conf.	N. Ind. Conf.	Ind. Conf.	Total.
1912	\$153	\$----	\$----	\$153
1913	222	200	340	762
1914	339	533	480	1,325
1915	375	732	556	1,663
1916	441	748	643	1,832
1917	661	885	1,071	2,617
1918	833	----	----	833
Total	<u>\$3,024</u>	<u>\$3,098</u>	<u>\$3,090</u>	<u>\$9,212.⁴</u>

Seemingly not a very flattering report when one considers that the total wealth of the church was about \$12,000,000 in

³ *Special Report of the Bureau of Census, 1906. Part I, 46.*

⁴ Statistics taken from the reports of the three Indiana conferences for the years beginning 1912 and through 1918. In 1918 the North Indiana conference and the Indiana conference had discontinued that form of benevolence.

1917. This means that about one dollar for every \$1,400 worth of wealth was expended toward the extinction of the greatest enemy of the church; the one about which they prayed the most, preached the loudest, and offered the greatest number of resolutions. It must be borne in mind, however, that the church has been a large contributor to the Anti-Saloon league.

These new organizations added new zest to the temperance agitation and things began again to move. In 1886 a few of the more ardent members of the Republican party who were enthusiastic temperance workers met on October 20 and held a convention in the interest of that cause. It came to be known as the Republican Local Option league. E. B. Reynolds called the meeting to order and officers were elected. After this, resolutions were offered which declared that since the Democratic party was under the complete control of the liquor forces it was the first duty of the temperance men in the state to combine and defeat them at the next election. There may have been a grain of partisan tactics in the movement. Moreover, they favored local option as the most safe and democratic principle upon which to found the league. Before the close of the meeting delegates to the National Republican Anti-Saloon conference were appointed.⁵ Just what influence this organization had cannot be determined.

Another movement, one that gave considerable momentum to the temperance fight, began a great deal earlier than this period but only gained prominence in the state about this time. It was the Prohibition Party. Organized in 1869 at Oswego, New York, it took for its fundamental principle direct opposition to the manufacture, sale, and use of all intoxicating drinks, except for scientific purposes. Gradually it spread until it reached Indiana sometime during the early eighties. Certainly it is not mentioned much before this time, and no votes were cast for their presidential candidate until 1884 when John P. St. John was the presidential nominee.

In spite of the heroic measures adopted it never gained any very great prominence as a party. Like all third parties it had varied and uncertain history, but unlike them it lasted much longer than any other. The following table will afford

⁵ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1886, 476.

an opportunity for an estimation of their political value in the state.

Year.	Candidate.	Prohibition Vote.	Total Vote Possible.
1884	St. John	3,028	494,793
1888	Fiske	9,881	536,949
1892	Bidwell	13,050	553,613
1896	Levering	5,323 ⁶	637,124
1900	Wooley	13,718	663,840
1904	Swallow	23,496	681,934
1908	Chafin	18,045	721,126
1912	Chafin	19,249	654,474
1916	Hanley	16,368	717,189. ⁷

Although the prohibition party has never elected a presidential candidate and will probably cease to exist in view of the present conditions, it has, however, had a great influence. Many times they have held the balance of power between the two major parties.

By 1880 the Woman's Christian Temperance union had been thoroughly organized and adopted a formal constitution and by-laws. Article two of their constitution says that

The object of the organization is to enlist and unite the women of the entire state in temperance work, and devise and execute measures, which, with the blessing of God, will result in the suppression of intemperance, and secure as soon as possible the entire prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks.⁸

Provision was made for state organization, the formation of district unions, county unions and local unions. All of these divisions had constitutions that were quite similar, except of course that each of the lower organizations were directly responsible to the one higher up in all matters relating to policy and administration. Departments of work were also maintained. These ranged in number from fifteen to thirty-five. Among the most important were the following:

1. Homes for orphan and pauper children.
2. Young women's and youth's work.
3. Kindergarten work.

⁶ There was a split in the party at this time over the Silver question.

⁷ *Cyclopedia of American Government*, III, 33-46. *World's Almanac*, 1919, 150.

⁸ Constitution and By-Laws of W. C. T. U. in Indiana.

4. Juvenile and Sunday School Department.
5. Department of Scientific Instruction.
6. Department of Heredity and Hygiene.
7. Evangelistic Department.
8. Department for Suppression of Impure Literature.
9. Work for colored people.
10. Work for the Germans.
11. State and County Fair work.
12. Department for Soldiers and Sailors.
13. Department for the overthrow of the opium habit.
14. Franchise Department.
15. Department for Promotion of Social Purity co-operating with the White Cross League, etc.⁹

In this manner the work in the state was thoroughly systematized, and the movement grew greatly in strength and influence. The following table will give some idea of the growth of the society in the state up to, and including the year 1893. After that time it grew until its membership was 12,700 in 1918 and the income something like eight thousand dollars, double that of 1904.

Year	Counties organized	Local Unions	Member-ship	Juvenile Societies	Money Received
1880	--	31	616	---	\$-----
1881	--	78	823	---	-----
1882	--	80	1,532	---	-----
1883	--	72	1,856	46	761.29
1884	--	101	2,565	57	2,229.39
1885	--	91	2,101	70	1,229.30
1886	--	110	2,082	37	1,112.58
1887	36	125	2,517	41	1,477.85
1888	30	180	3,727	46	1,819.79
1889	33	180	3,550	65	1,715.87
1890	47	234	5,079	104	3,639.37
1891	65	276	4,864	125	3,675.76
1892	76	327	5,535	168	4,510.31
1893	75	327	5,106	144	5,190.25. ¹⁰

Along with this material growth came a great increase in the influence wielded by them throughout the state. As stated in one of their reports, "By what system of mathematics shall

⁹ Reports of W. C. T. U. of Indiana. Any one after 1885.

¹⁰ Report of W. C. T. U. 1893, 75.

we compute the spiritual and intellectual development of the women engaged in our work?" Nor was it confined to the women. By their petitions and prayers and organization many institutions were affected, particularly the legislative assembly as well as local governing bodies. At Osgood they quietly nominated a town ticket and had it printed. On the day of the election the tickets were distributed without any one knowing the origin. Voters were so well pleased with it that they elected the entire group.¹¹ Previous to this they had prepared a bill to the General Assembly to place Scientific Instruction in the schools of the state. It passed the House by a vote of fifty-four to thirty-nine and was defeated in the Senate by a vote of twenty-two to twenty. Petitions for its passage had been presented from sixty-five counties. The signatures aggregated 16,004 to which might be added a great many individual letters.¹²

The proper local authorities shall on and after September 1, 1885 require all pupils in all schools supported by public money, or under state control, to study as a regular branch, physiology and hygiene which shall in each division of the subject so pursued give special reference to the effects of alcoholic drinks, stimulants and narcotics upon the human system.

No person shall teach in the public schools, or in any school under state control in the state of Indiana after the first day of January, 1886, who has not passed a satisfactory examination in physiology and hygiene with special reference to alcoholic drinks, stimulants, and narcotics upon the human system.

No certificate of fitness to teach, issued by any authority previous to the passage of the act shall exempt the holder thereof from the examination required by this statute.

The salaries or payment for the services as teachers, school examiners, or school officers of any grade, shall be made void by the failure of such teachers, school examiners, or school officials to comply with the provisions of this statute. Report of Indiana W. C. T. U. 1885, 50.

Temperance meetings, rallies and medal contests were held all over the state. Thousands of pages of literature were distributed annually, poems were written, temperance songs were sung, house to house canvasses were made, all in the interest of absolute prohibition. In fact the work increased in such proportions that they were one of the three most important factors in the recent "dry" campaign.¹³

¹¹ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1888, 323.

¹² Following is the bill which the W. C. T. U. kept before the legislature from 1885 until its passage in 1895:

¹³ The following song, written by Kate Lunden, a native Scandinavia, was used a great deal in the work and meetings of the W. C. T. U.

Working with the W. C. T. U. as sub-organizations were the Young Woman's Christian Temperance union and the Loyal Temperance legion, to which must be given considerable credit. The Y. W. C. T. U. was organized November 10, 1879, by some thirty young ladies who had assembled in the study of the Second Presbyterian church in Indianapolis. The object of the society as defined in their constitution was to "plan and carry forward the measures which with the blessings of

WHITE RIBBON SPANGLED BANNER

Fling out to the breeze; let it tell to the world
That the faith which has raised it will never surrender,
Let it tell that the love which our banner unfurled,
Is the guard of the home and the nation's defender.
Let it gleam as a star, for the ship-wrecked afar,
Like a beacon that warns of the treacherous bar;
Let that banner of freedom and purity wave
As a signal of hope 'midst the perils of the brave.

Hold that banner aloft; let our colors be seen
From Siberian snowfields to African valleys;
Lift it up for the truth; let the rays of its sheen
Drive the shadows of night from the by-ways and alleys.
Let it tell to the lost that we count not the cost;
That our bridges are burned and our Rubicon crossed;
That the banner of mother-love ever shall wave,
Till the paths are made straight for the sin-burdened slave.

Let it fly at the front; it is washed in our tears
And the smoke of the battle enhances its whiteness,
Though our hearts may be pierced by the enemy's spears,
Yet the flow from our wounds shall but add to its brightness,
And this ensign of right, it shall float o'er the fight,
Till our wrongs are avenged by the triumph of Right;
And in radiant victory at last it shall wave,
O'er the ramparts we've stormed, o'er King Alcohol's grave.

Swing it out from the staff; let it shadow the ground
Where the fathers of liberty sleep 'neath the mosses;
Run it up o'er the homes where the mothers are found
Who through the watches of anguish are counting their losses,
In the tear-moistened sod, which our martyrs have trod,
We are planting it deep for our land and our God;
And the banner of the world-circling lover o'er shall wave
In the name of our Christ, who is mighty to save.

God, shall result in total abstinence". The meetings were largely social, literary and special work, but the idea that they were a temperance society was kept prominently in mind.¹⁴

The Loyal Temperance legion, organized some time later, desired to gather all of the members of the various juvenile societies under the auspices of the W. C. T. U. so that they could be one central state organization. Their secondary object was to form companies of Loyal legions in every town and city in the state and to maintain a high standard among those already formed. They had a rapid growth and considerable influence.¹⁵ Other sub-organizations such as the Bands of Hope grew up also but since they were quite similar to the others they will not be given consideration.

The official organ of the W. C. T. U. and these sub-organizations was the *Organizer*, a twelve page weekly published by the Organizer Publishing Company of Lafayette. Besides this publication the same company put out several other papers, chief of which were, *The Eastern Star* (a sixteen page monthly), the *Convention Reporter* (a sixteen page quarterly), *The Institute Items* (an eight page quarterly), *The Glad Tidings* (one issue of sixteen pages). Other papers affiliated with the temperance work and the various W. C. T. U. movements were the *Union Signal*, *The Message*, and the *Young Crusader*.¹⁶

Besides these two and the W. C. T. U. there were many minor societies having as their aim the prohibition of the liquor traffic. One of these which later did some very creditable work was the Lincoln legion, a temperance organization standing for Gospel Temperance and pledge signing. It was organized at Oberlin, Ohio in 1903, under the auspices of the Anti-Saloon league. The name was taken from a pledge which Lincoln signed in his early days. It read:

Whereas, the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage is productive of pauperism, degradation and crime; and believing it our duty to dis-

¹⁴ Minutes of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the W. C. T. U. 1882, 27.

¹⁵ The rallying cry of the Loyal legion was as follows:

Rah! Rah! Rah!
We clover blossoms are a-field,
Why? Saloons must die.
Hear their knell.
Indiana L. T. L.

¹⁶ Various Reports of the W. C. T. U. The *Organizer* had a good circulation.

courage that which produces more evil than good, we therefore pledge ourselves to abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage.

This pledge was adopted by the legion. Both state and county organizations were provided for by the laws of the society. It was not long until several hundred thousand persons had been organized so near us it was only a short time until it hit Indiana with considerable force and for quite a while had its share of influence.¹⁷

Still other societies made their appearance; the Youth's Temperance Alliance of America, organized in 1907; the National Temperance Society, which organized the former. Besides these there were many others which, perhaps, did not have a very widespread influence. Some of them were as follows: The International Order of Good Templars, The International Reform Bureau, The Catholic Total Abstinence Union, The Templars of Honor and Temperance, The Order of The Sons of Temperance, The Royal Templars of Temperance, but these seemed to work through the medium of the two or three main and central temperance bodies rather than for themselves as a local order.

Without doubt one of the most potent factors in the recent victory of the temperance forces was the Indiana Anti-Saloon league. It had its beginning as a national movement in 1893, but did not reach Indiana until 1898 when it was organized here under the direction of Howard H. Russell. In reality it was the church in action against the liquor traffic. Such a movement had never been inaugurated before, yet with its installation came more efficient methods of combat. The religious bodies of the state, who, during the latter part of the movement, numbered well over six hundred thousand members, elected the trustees that governed the league and were, therefore, responsible for the policy of the organization. The purpose of the league, like the Temperance Alliance of former days, was to federate upon all temperance questions, upon all religious, and upon all moral issues in the state. It was non-sectarian, but christian; non-partisan, but patriotic; and, the whole movement was directed exclusively against the beverage liquor traffic. The league did its work under five different departments each of which was presided over by an executive

¹⁷ *Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, 715.

head known as the state superintendent. These departments were as follows: (1) the organization department, (2) the platform department, (3) the legal department, (4) the publicity department, (5) the finance department.

With such an organization they have been able to accomplish wonders. Slightly before their organization only a very small part of the state was dry, but so thorough and so earnest has been their work that in less than two decades the state declared against the traffic forever. Their program for 1916 had been to elect a state legislature and a congressional delegation favorable to state and national prohibition, also a governor and other administrative officers to approve of and enforce the same. How successful they were will be seen when we come to study the liquor legislation during the session that followed.¹⁸ Their official organ besides their various pamphlets, papers, reports, books, etc., was the *Indiana Issue*, a monthly paper, begun in 1906 and lasting only a short time.

The latest temperance organization in the state as well as the most powerful and centralized, was the Indiana Dry Federation. A delegation of temperance people met at the Claypool Hotel on December 6, 1916, and began plans for the work. As outlined by them its purpose was as follows:

It is the sense of the Indiana Dry Federation that while its work is largely advisory, whenever possible it shall also voice to the state and to the legislature its wishes, as the united thought of all the participating bodies, thus presenting a united front at the time when it will count the most.¹⁹

The organizations which were represented and which affiliated themselves actively with the new association were: The Catholic Total Abstinence union, The Christian Women's Board of Missions, The Intercollegiate Prohibition Association, Presbyterian Temperance Board, The National Christian Board of Temperance, The Indiana State Horticultural Association, the W. C. T. U., the Indiana State Civic Union, The Dry Democratic Organization, The Flying Squadron, The Prohibition, and it was also announced that the Legislative Council of Indiana Women would co-operate with the Federation. The Anti-Saloon League refused to join.²⁰

¹⁸ Pamphlet issued by Anti-Saloon League, 1-3.

¹⁹ The Indianapolis *Star*, Dec. 7, 1916, p. 11, col. 2.

²⁰ The Indianapolis *News*, Dec. 13, 1916, p. 13, col. 2.

Money for the necessary expenses of the federation was raised by asking for contributions at prohibition mass meetings. Of such money collected twenty-five per cent of it was to be retained in the county where the meeting was held while the other seventy-five per cent was to be used for the expenses of the central organization.²¹

After the fall of the temperance forces in 1883 eight years elapsed before any more liquor legislation took place. Finally, however, in 1889 a law was passed which made it possible for an aggrieved applicant or for a remonstrant against the granting of a license to appeal from the decision of the board of county commissioners to the circuit court of the county. This might be done any time within ten days after the decision of the board. However, such undertaking must first be approved by the county auditor. If the appeal had not been filed within the allotted time it could not be granted. Besides this sufficient surety to pay all costs, which might be adjudged by the final decision, had to be guaranteed.²²

Another act the same year revised the statutes of 1881. Such revision read as follows:

No city or incorporated town shall charge any person who may obtain a license under the provisions of this act more than the following sums for a license to sell within their corporate limits; cities may charge two hundred fifty dollars and incorporated towns one hundred and fifty in addition to the sum which had to be paid into the county treasury.²³

Nothing more happened until 1893. Then the municipal governments of the cities were empowered to license, tax and regulate the selling or giving away of any spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors and to tax and regulate their places of business whether manufacture or store. Such jurisdiction extended four miles from the corporate limits of the city or town and did not invalidate any of the state laws in regard to the license, tax or regulation.²⁴ It is to be noted here that instead of the great number of societies which characterized the earlier movements, the tendency was toward centralization and more

²¹ Ibid. W. E. Carpenter of Brazil was chosen president of the Federation and Mrs. Culla J. Vayhinger president of the W. C. T. U. was chosen for their secretary

²² *Laws of Indiana*, 1889, 288.

²³ *Laws of Indiana*, 1889, 395.

²⁴ *Laws of Indiana*, 1893, 213.

complete organization. It is not surprising, therefore, to note that the chief societies for the furtherance of the temperance idea may be grouped under three different heads: The Anti-Saloon league, The Women's Christian Temperance union and the Indiana Dry Federation. During the latter part of 1916 all temperance organizations except the Anti-Saloon league subordinated themselves to the Indiana Dry Federation.

In addition to these there have been from time to time reform meetings, temperance rallies and conventions everywhere. Many examples of these are in evidence, but only one or two will be cited. At Brown's grove, two and one-half miles south of Liberty a rally was held on August 8, 1885. Noted preachers were present and spoke on the right of the people to control the liquor traffic by constitutional amendment.²⁵ Besides this many revivals were conducted throughout the state in the interest of the temperance forces. At Muncie, Thomas E. Murphy held a very successful meeting;²⁶ at Aurora, W. J. Murphy, son of Francis Murphy, held one of the greatest temperance revivals ever witnessed in that section of the country. The house was crowded to overflowing every night.²⁷ The same thing has been true every year since. Many papers, too, advocated total prohibition as a beverage. Of these the Indianapolis *Journal*, the *Phalanx* and many Republican papers were active along this line.²⁸

In 1895 a law was passed known as the Nicholson law. It provided that all persons applying for a license had to specifically describe the room in which he, she or they desired to sell liquors along with the exact location of the same. Such applicant must be of good moral character, over twenty-one years of age and be the proprietor in person of the said place of business. Additional provisions prevented the placing of screens or blinds in such a position as to hide the interior of the room from the street. Minors were prohibited from going into the room for any purpose whatever. In addition a remonstrance clause made it possible for a majority of the voters of any township or ward to prevent any saloon or other liquor

²⁵ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1885, 229.

²⁶ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1889, 76.

²⁷ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1889, 92.

²⁸ *Western Christian Advocate*, 1886, 301, 461, etc.

shop being set up in that district. In order to do this a remonstrance had to be signed by the majority of the voters of the said unit and filed with the county auditor three days before the regular session of the board of commissioners. If this were properly done it was unlawful to issue a license in that township or ward for a period of two years from the date of the filing of such remonstrance. However, should any license be granted under those conditions it was null and void and the holder was liable under the laws of the state just the same as if he had never had a license. The number which constituted the majority of voters referred to above was determined by the aggregate vote cast in the unit district for the candidate running for the highest office at the last election preceding the filing of the remonstrance. Drug stores were not permitted to sell in less quantities than a quart and then only upon a written prescription from a practicing physician. Adequate penalties for the non-observance of all of these clauses were provided; they ranged from a fine of ten dollars to two hundred and imprisonment not to exceed six months.²⁹

In regard to the municipal government the cities were also authorized to license, regulate and restrain all places where intoxicating liquors were kept for sale. They were given power to designate the room, or building; might direct the arrangement of the doors and windows; and, might also direct the location of the bar and other interior furnishings. They were also given jurisdiction over the kinds of games that were to be allowed in the establishment.³⁰

At the earnest request of the W. C. T. U. and other organizations the General Assembly passed, during this same year, an act requiring that a study of the nature of alcoholic drinks and narcotics and their effects on the human system be placed in the common school curriculum in connection with physiology and hygiene. All educational institutions supported wholly or in part by the state had also to include them. These were to be regularly taught. Boards of education were instructed to provide the machinery for such a movement. In places where it was impossible to get a text book oral teaching could fill the requirements. Teachers from that date were expected

²⁹ *Laws of Indiana*, 1895, 248-52.

³⁰ *Laws of Indiana*, 1895, 182.

to pass an examination in the subject before being allowed to teach. Dismissal from employment was the penalty attached for anyone who neglected or refused to teach the subject.³¹ The importance of this move cannot be estimated too highly, and the temperance forces, particularly the W. C. T. U., cannot be commended too greatly for their perseverance in this direction. It is a significant fact that twenty-two years after the children of the state had begun to be taught the significance of the evil, they insisted that the General Assembly protect their homes from its influence.

At the next session two acts were passed. One of these empowered the trustees of incorporated towns to license, regulate or restrain the sale of spirituous, vinous, malt and other intoxicating liquors within the corporation.³² This was much the same law as the one that had been passed in 1893. Besides this a revision of the old existing law of 1881 was attempted.

This law read that any one who desired to sell liquor in less quantities than a quart must first obtain a license; obviously then it had been possible for anyone to evade the law by selling in greater quantities than a quart. This new law included the sale of all liquors in quantities up to five gallons. The license fee at this time was changed to one hundred dollars for spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors. No distinction was made between them as had been done formerly. Other slight changes were made but not enough to be of any material consequence.³³

The agitation had not reached great heights yet since the last defeat, so not a great deal of pressure had been brought to bear on the legislators. On the other hand there was still enough sentiment to keep the issue before the people. This led to a readjustment of the laws from time to time. Consequently again in 1901 another act was passed which made it unlawful for the prosecuting attorney or his deputy to act directly or indirectly as an agent or council to assist an applicant in obtaining a license to retail intoxicating liquors under the laws of the state. A fine of not less than one hundred nor more than one thousand dollars was the penalty to which might

³¹ *Laws of Indiana*, 1895, 375.

³² *Laws of Indiana*, 1897, 176.

³³ *Laws of Indiana*, 1897, 253-4.

be added imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed six months.³⁴

The next year brought forth still another law relating to regulation. This law prevented anyone or any company from keeping a saloon or other place where intoxicating liquors might be sold within one mile of any national or state military home or army post. The penalty for not observing this law was a fine ranging from one hundred dollars to one thousand and imprisonment in the county jail for not less than ten nor more than thirty days.³⁵

In 1905 the whole liquor situation was revolutionized by the passage of the Moore liquor law. It embodied mainly a revision of the Nicholson law of 1895. It provided that after proper application had been made for a license should a remonstrance signed by a majority of the legal voters of any township or ward in a city situated in the said county be filed with the county auditor three days before the regular meeting of the board of county commissioners, it was unlawful for the commissioners to grant the applicant a license during the period of two years from the date of the filing of the remonstrance. The big change took place in the following. If such a remonstrance were made against all applicants then it was unlawful for the commissioners to grant a license to any applicant during the two years after that date. The form of a remonstrance against a particular person was as follows:

State of Indiana, county of Kosciusko, ss: To the honorable board of commissioners of the said county:

We, the undersigned, legal voters in the township of Harrison (or third ward in the city of Warsaw), in said county and state, hereby respectfully represent that we are opposed to the granting of a license to John A. Brown who has given notice of his intention to apply therefore, for the sale of intoxicating liquors in said township or ward.

The form which was to be used for any and all applicants was as follows:

State of Indiana, county of Grant, ss: To the honorable board of commissioners of said county:

We, the undersigned, legal voters in the township of Harrison (or third ward in the City of Marion), in the county and state aforesaid do hereby respectfully represent that we are opposed to the traffic in intoxi-

³⁴ *Laws of Indiana*, 1901, 305.

³⁵ *Laws of Indiana*, 1903, 383.

cating liquors and we hereby object to the granting of a license to any person for the sale of intoxicating liquors in the said township (or ward).³⁶

In addition to this other minor acts appeared during the session. Anyone who adulterated liquors in any manner was liable to a fine of ten to one hundred dollars.³⁷ Another section of the same act provided that anyone convicted of using any poison in the manufacture of liquor should be fined not to exceed five hundred dollars and imprisoned in the state prison for not less than one nor more than seven years.³⁸ Still another section provided that anyone found in a state of intoxication should be fined not to exceed five dollars for the first offense, not to exceed twenty-five dollars for the second offense, and not more than one hundred dollars for the third offense. To the last might be added five to thirty days imprisonment, disfranchisement, and incapability to hold office.³⁹ The next section provides a fine of not less than ten nor more than one hundred dollars and imprisonment of not less than thirty days nor more than a year for persons convicted of selling, giving or bartering any intoxicating liquors to any person at that time in a state of intoxication. In addition to this, disfranchisement and being rendered incapable of holding office might be added.⁴⁰ Selling to an habitual drunkard was an equal offense except that the minimum fine was fifty dollars instead of ten.⁴¹ When anyone sold liquors to any person under the age of twenty-one they might be fined not less than twenty nor more than one hundred dollars.⁴² Besides these provisions there were a few others; misrepresenting the age to obtain liquor, furnishing liquor to a prisoner, keeping a disorderly shop, selling on Sunday and legal holidays, druggists selling on Sunday and legal holidays, selling or trading near a camp meeting, or having a saloon within one mile of a soldiers' home. All of these were made crimes punishable by fines ranging from ten to one hundred dollars, to which could be

³⁶ *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 7, 8.

³⁷ *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 714.

³⁸ *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 715.

³⁹ *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 720.

⁴⁰ *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 720.

⁴¹ *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 721.

⁴² *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 721.

added imprisonment in the county jail of ten to sixty days.⁴³

But this did not suffice and the question came up again in 1907. This time it was a revision of the old Baxter law of 1873. The major part of these changes read:

Any person not being licensed under the laws of the state of Indiana who shall sell or barter, directly or indirectly, any spirituous, vinous or malt liquors in less quantities than five gallons at a time, or who shall sell or barter, directly or indirectly, any spirituous, vinous or malt liquors to be drunk, or suffered to be drunk in his house, outhouse, garden, or appurtenances thereto belonging, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not less than fifty nor more than one hundred dollars for the first offense.

and not less than one hundred nor more than five hundred dollars, to which might be added imprisonment from thirty days to six months, for the second and subsequent offenses. In addition to this were many minor clauses especially designed to aid the enforcement of the above.⁴⁴ All railroad companies which permitted liquors to be sold on any of their cars had to pay annually to the state one thousand dollars to obtain a license to sell. In case they failed to pay the said sum the auditor of the state assessed against them the above amount plus fifty percent as a penalty and then in case of non-payment action might be brought against the railroad by the attorney for the state.⁴⁵ Another act similar to this revision of the Baxter law was passed during the year. It was practically the same with the exception that it did not mention any specified amount that might be sold and applied only to persons attempting to carry on a liquor trade without a license.⁴⁶ Still another act provided that druggists might sell in quantities of not less than one quart on a prescription by a reputable active physician. Another act the same year made all names attached to a remonstrance legal without further proof. The mere fact that they were attached was *prima facie* evidence

⁴³ *Laws of Indiana*, 1905, 583. In case of establishing a saloon within one mile of a Soldiers' Home the fine ranged from one hundred to one thousand dollars to which was added from ten to thirty days in the county jail.

⁴⁴ *Laws of Indiana*, 1907, 27-33.

⁴⁵ *Laws of Indiana*, 1907, 658-9.

⁴⁶ *Laws of Indiana*, 1907, 698-90.

that they were *bona fide* legal voters of the township or ward as provided by the law.⁴⁷

The agitation had become quite strong by this time. Meetings were held all over the state; petitions were sent to the General Assembly as often as they met; and public sentiment had again reached the pinnacle. Because of these movements one of the most significant acts of the whole struggle—the County Local Option law as brought forth by the legislature during their special session of 1908—took place. Called together by Governor Hanley for the express purpose of passing this bill the legislature, after considerable debate, and delay, did make it a law. It provided that whenever a petition had been signed by not less than twenty per cent of the aggregate vote of the said county, and then filed with the auditor of the county, the board of commissioners at their next regular session should order a special election to be held in not less than twenty nor more than thirty days. These elections were to be held at the regular places for voting after ten days' notice had been given. The form of the above petition was as follows:

PETITION FOR LOCAL OPTION ELECTION

To the Board of Commissioners of the County of _____;

We, the undersigned, legal voters of _____ county, state of Indiana, would respectfully petition that an election be held to determine whether the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage shall be prohibited in said county.⁴⁸

Name _____ Address _____

When the time for the election came the ballots were to be furnished to the voters in the following form:

☐ Yes

SHALL THE SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS
AS A BEVERAGE BE PROHIBITED?

☐ No

⁴⁷ Acts of 1907, 281.

⁴⁸ *Laws of Indiana*, Special Session, 1908, 4-5. No voter could sign his name after the petition had been filed, neither could he withdraw his name after the petition had been filed. The aggregate vote was determined by the number of votes cast in the county for the secretary of state at the last election preceding the local option election.

All votes marked with a cross in the square containing the word "yes" were to be counted in favor of prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors, and likewise all those marked in the square containing the word "no" were to be counted in favor of no prohibition.⁴⁹ Other provisions for the election machinery were made but they were much the same as those of the general elections and need not be given.

This law seemed to work admirably in spite of the fact that there was considerable criticism. County after county went dry until only the strongholds of intemperance remained. But with the change of legislature in 1911 came a revision of the work. After some slight amendments in the wording and phrasing of the county local option law the General Assembly of this year repealed the entire act. This was replaced by a law similar in every respect to the 1908 law except that the township and ward was made the unit instead of the county. So near were they alike that a re-statement of the 1911 law is not necessary.⁵⁰

But the public was not satisfied with the new act. After having experienced something better they were not willing to return to a law that seemed to them less efficient and less

⁴⁹ After an election had been held no subsequent election could be held in that county for at least a period of two years from the date of the last preceding election. When a majority were in favor of prohibition then the county was to go dry at the end of ninety days from the date of the election. This act did not repeal any part of the act of 1895 or the act of 1905.

The bill was introduced by Senator Cox. Those who voted in favor of it in the Senate were as follows: Beardsley, Bland, Bowser, Ganiard, Goodwine, Hanna, Hawkins, Kimbrough, Kirkman, Kittinger, Kling, Lane, McCallum, Mattingly, Mock, Moore of Fayette, Moore of Putnam, Orndorf, Parks of Marshal, Pearson, Pilzer, Roemler, Springer, Stephenson, Strange, Wickwire, Wood of Tippecanoe. Total, 32.

Those who voted against it were as follows: Benz, Bingham, Durre, Gonnerman, Hugg, Kistler, Law, McDowell, Moss, Parks of Clark, Paterson, Ranke Shafer, Slack, Stotsenburg, Tyndall and Wood of Jackson. Total, 17. *Senate Journal*, 1908, pp. 66-7. *Senate Journal* also reported it as passing the House, 103.

⁵⁰ *Laws of Indiana*, 1911, 363-70. This bill was introduced by Senator Proctor. Those voting in favor of the township unit were as follows: Akin, Beal, Carelton, Clark, Curtis, Durre, Farlow, Hauck, Jackson, Kistler, LaMont, Long, Farrell, Fleming, Gers, Grube, Greenwell, Harlan, Netterville, Parks, Powers, Proctor, Royse, Shively, Stotsenburg, Sullivan, Trautman, Traylor. Total 28.

Those opposed to it were as follows: Brady, Crumpacker, Gavit, Halleck, Hanna, Hibberd, Hunt, Kane, Kimmel, Lambert, Moore, McCarty, Patts, Sexson, Strange, White, Wood. Total, 17. *Senate-Journal* 1911, 1984.

It passed the House by a vote of fifty-eight to thirty-three. *House Journal* 1911, 1703.

democratic than the one of 1908. Consequently more agitation and more legislation took place. In 1913 some slight changes took place, but these were not far-reaching in consequence, so only their general nature will be given. One act was passed prohibiting the drinking of intoxicating liquors or allowing them to be drunk upon any railroad locomotive, passenger coach, interurban car, street car, or vehicle commonly used for the transportation of passengers, or upon any common carrier, or in or about any railroad depot, station, ticket office, waiting room or platform. Penalties for the violation of this act were provided.⁵¹

Another act amending the one of 1911 was passed. It declared that no license or any renewal thereof should be granted or issued for a greater or less period than one year. Some minor provisions were also incorporated in this act, but they were inconsequential.⁵²

Still another act provided for the license fee to be refunded should the supreme court decide that through no fault of the licensee the money had been paid and the license illegally granted. This usually applied where the board of commissioners had no right to issue a license.⁵³ Two other minor provisions concerning the application by a receiver for a saloon to transfer a license, and preventing the prosecuting attorney or his deputy from representing an applicant for a license, were passed during the year.⁵⁴

In 1915 the act for refunding the license fee was slightly amended. The sense of the law was not changed, but some few revisions in the wording took place.⁵⁵

And yet the century-old problem had not been solved. It had only been juggled around from one year to the next, from one party to the other much the same as a juggler plays with his implements of amusement. Something must be done. Public opinion seemed ripe for the passage of a prohibitory law, but so had it been on other occasions. Before the beginning of the legislative assembly of 1917, however, a great

⁵¹ *Laws of Indiana*, 1913, 29. This did not apply to any train that carried with it a licensed buffet or dining car.

⁵² *Laws of Indiana*, 1913, 322.

⁵³ *Laws of Indiana*, 1913, 410.

⁵⁴ *Laws of Indiana*, 1913, 627, 738.

⁵⁵ *Laws of Indiana*, 1915, 20.

agitation began to be manifest throughout the state. The Anti-Saloon league had been active here since 1898, the W. C. T. U. had a firmer hold on the convictions of people than ever before, and the Indiana Dry Federation came into existence late in 1916. The fever of enthusiasm ran high. Demonstrations of all kinds were held, and with these outward manifestations went earnest and serious work beneath the surface. Both the anti-liquor and the liquor forces realized that this was to be a desperate struggle and both made preparation accordingly.

Because of the centralization of their forces the temperance people were, for the first time in the history of the whole struggle, placed on equal footing with the saloon element. With the state awaiting in breathless expectation, the 1917 session of the legislature opened. Before the end of the first month a bill intended to prohibit forever the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage was introduced and the fight was on.

Because of its importance the substance of the bill as it was finally passed will be given here:

After the second day of April, 1918, it shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, barter, exchange, give away, furnish or otherwise dispose of any liquors except as in this act provided.⁵⁶

Some of the exceptions are those that allowed men already in possession of properly bonded liquor to ship the remainder to other states allowing the sale; another action allowed the manufacture for domestic use of wine, cider, vinegar or other non-intoxicating drinks for private use; the manufacture of pure grain alcohol for medicinal, scientific, or mechanical purposes is also allowed, wine for sacramental purposes is provided for; wholesale druggists are allowed to sell in quantities of not less than one gallon pure grain alcohol for hospital or other medical purposes; a man in his own home may give guests intoxicating drinks providing his home is not used as a public resort of any kind; and a druggist may sell intoxicating liquors on a prescription by a reputable physician. Other minor provisions dealing with definitions, proper application for sales, unlawful distribution by club house members and prohibiting the advertisement of intoxicating liquors are in-

⁵⁶ *Laws of Indiana, 1917, 15-34.*

cluded. All of these clauses have provisions for penalties in case of violation.

Persons who violate this law or any part of it are subject to a fine of one hundred to five hundred dollars, to which is added a jail sentence of thirty days to six months. For the second offense the fine ranges from two hundred to five hundred with a jail sentence of sixty days to six months. For all subsequent offenses they are liable to the latter penalty. The penalties for the different clauses have been mentioned above.⁵⁷

While this bill was under discussion the dry forces of the entire state were especially active. The Madison *Courier* on January 23 stated that over four hundred thousand persons by petition asked the House to pass the prohibition law. Of these two hundred fifty thousand were voters, the remainder women. The Indiana Dry Federation presented three hundred thousand of them while the Anti-Saloon league presented the remaining hundred thousand. Besides these petitions W. J. Bryan spoke in Tomlinson Hall to one of the largest and most enthusiastic audiences that ever greeted him in Indianapolis, "dry" demonstrations took place daily, almost hourly, in the state house, on the streets and in the homes; pictures and cartoons appeared in all of the newspapers of the state while the battle was in progress; and "dry" propaganda was spread about everywhere. As a result of all of these demonstrations the bill passed the House by a vote of seventy to twenty-eight, and the Senate by a vote of thirty-eight to eleven.⁵⁸ Later it was

⁵⁷ *Laws of Indiana*, 1917, 15-34.

⁵⁸ The prohibitory bill was introduced by F. E. Wright of Randolph County. It passed the House on January 25, 1917. Those voting in favor of it in the House were as follows: Adams, Alldredge, Anderson, Baker, Behmer, Blackmore, Bonham, Buller, Burt, Clapp, Coggins, Cook, Cooper, Curry, Davis of Jay, Dilworth, Douglas, Duffey, Durham, Dynes, Eikenberry, Gentry, Green, Crube, Harker, Harmon, Henke, Hessong, Hoffman, Hougham, Houghton, Jacoby, Jameson, Jinnett, Johnson of Grant, Johnson of Pulaski and White, Kessler, Krieg, Kuhlman, Lafuze, McClaskey, McGonagle, McNagy, Mason, Mendenhall, Miles, Miller of Tippecanoe and Warren, Miller of Howard, Miltenberger, Montgomery, Moore, Mosier, Myers, Read, Robertson, Ryan, Scott, Sipe, Woods, Wood, Wright of Clay, Wright of Randolph, Yoder and Mr. Speaker. Total, 70.

Those opposing the measure were as follows: Bartel, Bayer, Cravens, Cronin, Davis of Lake, Downey, Elsterhold, Geddes, Gorski, Griffin, Habermel, Harris, Haslanger, Hepler, Hyland, Kimmel, Mushett, O'Leary, Osborn, Overmeyer, Sambor, Southard, Tinker, Turner, Waltz, Westfall, Westrick. Total, 28. *House Journal*, 1917, 157-8.

In the Senate the following named men voted for the bill: Armstrong,

signed by the governor and became a law, which took effect April 2, 1918. Up to the present time it has worked admirably; it will probably continue to do so.

Beardsley, Bracken, Chambers, Culbertson, Dobyns, Dorrell, Elsner, English, Fleming, Gemmill, Grant, Hagerty, Hemphill, Hudgins, Humphreys, Jackson, James, Laney, Lanz, McConaha, McCray, McKinley, Maston, Mercer, Metzger, Negley, Norman, Porter, Reidelbach, Retherford, Robinson, Signs, Simmons, Smith, Spaan, Summers and White. Total, 38.

Those who were opposed to the bill were as follows: Bird, Erskine, Hazen, Hirsch, Kinder, Kolsem, Nejd, Reser, Thornton, Van Auken, Wolfson. Total, 11. *Senate Journal*, 1917, 450-1.

Another act the same year provided that no license or extension of license to sell intoxicating liquor, retail or wholesale, in the state of Indiana prior to April 2, 1918 should be granted to any person except such person be a present holder of such a license or should become the holder of such a license by a lawful transfer or by order of the court.

Another section of the same law pro-rated the license fee for the time from January first to April second, 1918. It was made effective at once.

The Savage Allies of The Northwest

By ELMORE BARCE, Fowler, Ind.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE TRIBES

The waters of the Ohio "moving majestically along, noiseless as the foot of time, and as resistless,"¹ sweep from the junction of the Monongahela and Allegheny to the waters of the Mississippi, a distance of nine hundred miles, enclosing in their upper courses the island of Blannerhassett, below the mouth of the Little Kanawha, the island of Zane, near Wheeling, and leaping in a descent of twenty-two feet in a distance of two miles the Falls opposite the present city of Louisville. The lofty eminences which crowned its banks, the giant forests of oak and maple which everywhere approached its waters, the vines of the frost grape that wound their sinuous arms around the topmost branches of its tallest trees² presented a spectacle that filled the soul of the traveler at every graceful turn of the river with awe and wonder. In the spring a wonderful transformation took place in the brown woods. There suddenly appeared on every hand the opening flowers of the red bud, whose whole top appeared as one mass of red blossoms, interspersed with the white and pale-yellow blossoms of the dogwood, or *cornus florida*. Thus there extended "in every direction, at the same time, red, white and yellow flowers; at a distance each tree resembling in aspect so many large bunches of flowers everywhere dispersed in the woods."³ This was the Belle Riviere, or the beautiful river of the French, which they long and valiantly sought to hold against the advancing tides of English traders and land hunters. This was that glorious gate to the west, through which floated the rafts and keel-boats of the American settlers who took possession of the great northwest.

But notwithstanding the beauty and grandeur of this stream, there was not, at the close of the French and Indian

¹ Atwater *History of Ohio*, 10, 11.

² Atwater *History of Ohio*, 76.

³ Atwater *History of Ohio*, 78.

War, on the tenth of February, 1763, a single habitation of either white man or savage on either the Ohio or Indiana side, or on the Kentucky side of this river. Says General William Henry Harrison:

The beautiful Ohio rolled its 'amber tide' until it paid its tribute to the Father of Waters, through an unbroken solitude. Its banks were without a town or village, or even a single cottage, the curling smoke of whose chimney would give the promise of comfort and refreshment to a weary traveler.⁴

The reason of this solitude is apparent.

To the south of the Ohio lay the "Dark and Bloody Ground" of Kentucky; "Dark" because of its vast and almost impenetrable forests; "Bloody", because of the constant savage warfare waged within its limits by roving bands of Miami, Shawnees, Cherokees, and other tribes who resorted thither in pursuit of game.

The proud face of creation here presented itself, without the disguise of art. No wood had been felled; no field cleared; no human habitation raised; even the red man of the forest, had not put up his wigwam of poles and bark for habitation. But that mysterious Being, whose productive power, we call Nature, ever bountiful, and ever great, had not spread out this replete, and luxurious pasture, without stocking it with numerous flocks and herds; nor were their ferocious attendants, who prey upon them, wanting, to fill up the circle of created beings. Here was seen the timid deer; the towering elk; the fleet stag; the surly bear; the crafty fox; the ravenous wolf; the devouring panther; the insidious wild cat; the haughty buffalo, besides innumerable other creatures, winged, four-footed, or creeping.⁵

This was the common hunting ground of the wild men of the forest. None took exclusive possession, because none dared. The Ohio was a common highway of the Indian tribes, and while their warpaths and trails crossed it at frequent intervals, none were so bold as to exercise an exclusive dominion over it.

The vast territory to the northwest of the river Ohio covering more than two hundred and forty-four thousand square miles of the earth's surface, and comprising what are now the states of Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin, was,

⁴ William Henry Harrison, *A Discourse on the Aborigines of the Ohio Valley*, 23.

⁵ H. Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, 5.

in the year 1763, inhabited by the most ferocious and warlike tribes of savages, with the exception of the Iroquois, in North America. Chief among them were the Wyandots, Miamis, Shawnees, Delawares, Ottawas, Chippewas and Potawatomi. These were the seven tribes known in after years as the western confederacy, who fought so long and bitterly against the government of the United States, and who were at last conquered by the arms and genius of General Anthony Wayne in the year 1794.⁶

The Ottawas, Chippewas and Potawatomi formed a sort of loose confederacy known as the Three Fires, and Massas, a Chippewa chief, so referred to them at the treaty of Greenville.⁷

The Miamis, the most powerful of the confederates, were subdivided into the Eel Rivers, the Weas, and the Piankashaws. The Kickapoos, a small tribe which lived on the Sangamon, and the Vermillion of the Wabash, were associated generally with the Potawatomi, and were always allies of the English. The Winnebagoes of Wisconsin were of the linguistic family of the Sioux; were generally associated with the confederates against the Americans, and many of their distinguished warriors fought against General Harrison at Tippecanoe. The decadent tribes known as the Illinois did not play a conspicuous part in the history of the northwest.

While the limits of these various tribes may not be fixed with precision and boundary lines were often confused, still there were certain well recognized portions of the northwest that were under the exclusive control of certain nations, and these nations were extremely jealous of their rights, as shown by the anger and resentment of the Miamis at what they termed the encroachment of the Potawatomi at the treaty of Fort Wayne, in 1809.⁸

The Wyandots, for instance, were the incontestable owners of the country between the Cuyahoga and the Auglaize, in the present state of Ohio, their domain extending as far south as the divide between the waters of the Sandusky river and the

⁶ William Henry Harrison, *A Discourse on the Aborigines of the Ohio Valley*, 37.

⁷ *American State Papers. Indian Affairs.* Vol. I, 569-570.

⁸ *Indiana Magazine of History*, XI, 366.

Scioto, and embracing the southern shore of Lake Erie from Maumee Bay, to the mouth of the Cuyahoga. Large numbers of them were also along the northern shores of Lake Erie, in Canada.⁹ Their territory at one time probably extended much farther south toward the Ohio, touching the lands of the Miamis on the west, but certainly embracing parts of the Muskingum country, to which they had invited the ancient Delawares, respectfully addressed by them as "grand-fathers".¹⁰ Intermingled with the Wyandots south of Lake Erie were scattered bands of Ottawas, but they were tenants of the soil by sufferance, and not as of right.

The Miamis have been described by General Harrison as the most extensive land owners in the northwest. He stands on record as saying:

Their territory embraced all of Ohio, west of the Scioto; all of Indiana, and that part of Illinois, south of the Fox river, and Wisconsin, on which frontier they were intermingled with the Kickapoos and some other small tribes.¹¹

What Harrison describes as the most beautiful portion of this country, that along the Ohio, was unoccupied, but in the latter part of the eighteenth century the Miamis and Piankashaws granted permission to the Delawares to occupy portions of the country between the Ohio and White rivers.¹² Harrison was probably right as to the ancient and original bounds of this tribe, but Little Turtle, their most famous chieftain, said at the treaty of Greenville, in 1795:

It is well known by all my brothers present, that my forefather kindled the first fire at Detroit; from thence, he extended his lines to the headwater of Scioto; from thence, to its mouth; from thence, down the Ohio, to the mouth of the Wabash, and from thence to Chicago, on lake Michigan.¹³

The truth is that the ancient demesne of the Miamis was much curtailed by the irruption of three tribes from the north in about the year 1765, the Sacs and Foxes, the Kickapoos and the Potawatomi, who conquered the old remnants of the Illinois tribes in the buffalo prairies and divided their country

⁹ W. H. Harrison, *Aborigines of the Ohio Valley*, 22.

¹⁰ Bureau of American Ethnology, *Handbook of American Indians*. I, 385.

¹¹ W. H. Harrison, *Aborigines of the Ohio Valley*, 23.

¹² Bureau of American Ethnology, *Handbook of American Indians*. I, 385.

¹³ *American State Papers. Indian Affairs*. I, 570, 571.

among themselves. Says Hiram Beckwith, in speaking of the Potawatomi:

Always on friendly terms with the Kickapoos, with whom they lived in mixed villages, they joined the latter and the Sacs and Foxes in the exterminating war upon the Illinois tribes, and afterwards obtained their allotment of the despoiled domain.¹⁴

The Potawatomi advancing by sheer force of numbers, rather than by conquest, finally appropriated a large part of the lands in the present state of Indiana, north of the Wabash, commingling with the Kickapoos at the south and west, and advancing their camps as far down as Pine creek. The Miamis were loud in their remonstrances against this trespassing and denounced the Pottawatomi as squatters, "never having had any lands of their own, and being mere intruders upon the prior estates of others",¹⁵ but the Potawatomi were not dispossessed and were afterwards parties to all treaties with the United States government for the sale and disposal of said lands. The Miamis also lost a part of their lands on the lower west side of the Wabash to the Kickapoos. Pushing eastward from the neighborhood of Peoria, the Kickapoos established themselves on the Vermillion, where they had a village on both sides of that river at its confluence with the main stream. They were, says Hiram Beckwith,

Greatly attached to the Vermillion and its tributaries, and Governor Harrison found it a difficult task to reconcile them to ceding it away.¹⁶

To the last, however, the Miamis remained the undisputed lords and masters of most of the territory watered by the two Miamis of Ohio and by the Wabash and its tributaries down to the Ohio. The French traders, officers and agents, passing from Detroit and Lake Erie down the Maumee, or Miami of the Lakes, came to Kekionga, or the "great Miami village" at the junction of the Saint Marys and the St. Joseph, crossed over the portage of eight miles to the Little Wabash and thence descended the Wabash to Ouiatenon, the post at Vincennes and the whole basin of the Ohio and Mississippi. In a day when the means of communication between distant points in the

¹⁴ *Fergus Historical Series.* IV, No. 27, 174.

¹⁵ *Fergus Historical Series.* IV, No. 27, 174.

¹⁶ *Fergus Historical Series.* IV, No. 27, 125.

northwest was almost wholly by canoes, a central position midway on one of the most important trade routes used by *voyageurs* and *coureurs de bois* in passing to and from the main trading point of the French at Detroit, was of the utmost importance, and the tribe of savages who commanded the valleys along that route were apt to be assiduously courted by all nations who desired to control the highly remunerative fur trade of that day.¹⁷

The Miami village of Kekionga was also of great strategic value from the military standpoint. To occupy this position went far towards commanding the whole Indian country. The French early established themselves there, and later the English, and when the Americans after the Revolution took dominion over the northwest and found it necessary to conquer the tribes of the Wabash and their allies, one of the first moves of the United States government was to attack the villages at this place, break up the line of their communication with the British at Detroit, and overawe the Miamis by the establishment of a strong military post. In the instructions from the secretary of war to General St. Clair, in the year 1791, the following occurs:

You will commence your march for the Miami village, in order to establish a strong and permanent military post at that place. The post at the Miami village is intended for awing and curbing the Indians in that quarter, and as the only preventive for future hostilities. It ought, therefore, to be rendered secure against all attempts and insults by the Indians. The garrison which should be stationed there ought not only to be sufficient for the defense of the place, but always to afford a detachment of five or six hundred men, either to chastise any of the Wabash, or other hostile Indians, or to secure any convoy of provisions. The establishment of said post is considered as an important object of the campaign, and is to take place in all events.¹⁸

St. Clair was defeated, but when General Wayne won the battle of Fallen Timbers in the valley of the Maumee, in 1794, and established and garrisoned a post at Fort Wayne, he not only put an effectual curb upon the British influence in the Wabash valley, but he caused the Little Turtle and the principal chiefs of the Miamis to retire from the British council fires and sue for peace.

¹⁷ James R. Albach, *Annals of West*, 80.

¹⁸ Dillon *History of Indiana*. I, 280-281.

Wayne insisted at the peace with the Miamis and their allies, at Greenville, Ohio, in 1795, that a tract six miles square around the newly established post at Fort Wayne should be ceded to the United States, together with "one piece two miles square on the Wabash river, at the end of the portage from the Miami of the Lake (Maumee), and about eight miles westward from Fort Wayne."¹⁹

This proposal was stoutly resisted by the Little Turtle, who among other things said:

The next place you pointed to, was the Little river, and said you wanted two miles square at that place. This is a request that our fathers, the French or British, never made of us; it was always ours. This carrying place has heretofore proved, in a great degree, the subsistence of your younger brothers. That place has brought to us, in the course of one day, the amount of one hundred dollars. Let us both own this place and enjoy in common the advantage it affords.²⁰

Despite this argument, however, Wayne prevailed, and the control of Kekionga and the portage passed to the government; that ancient Kekionga described by Little Turtle as

the Miami village, that glorious gate, which your younger brothers had the happiness to own, and through which all the good words of our chiefs had to pass from the north to the south, and from the east to the west.²¹

Returning to the Potawatomi, it will be seen that this tribe, which originally came from the neighborhood of Green Bay, was probably from about the middle of the eighteenth century, in possession of most of the country from the Milwaukee river in Wisconsin, around the south shore of Lake Michigan, to Grand River, "extending southwest over a large part of northern Illinois, east across Michigan to Lake Erie, and south in Indiana to the Wabash."²² The Sun, or Kee-sass, a Potawatomi of the Wabash, said at the treaty of Greenville, that his tribe was composed of three divisions; those of the river Huron, in Michigan, those of the St. Joseph of Lake Michigan, and the bands of the Wabash. In the year 1765, George Croghan, Indian agent of the British government, found the Potawatomi in villages on the north side of the

¹⁹ *United States Statutes at Large. Indian Treaties*, 1856, page 50.

²⁰ *American State Papers. Indian Affairs*. I, 576.

²¹ *American State Papers. Indian Affairs*. I, 576.

²² Bureau of American Ethnology, *Handbook of American Indians*, I, part two, 290.

Wabash at Ouatonenon, with a Kickapoo village in close proximity, while the Weas had a village on the south side of the river.²³ This would indicate that the Potawatomi had already pushed the Miami tribe south of the Wabash and had taken possession of the country.

Far away to the north and on both shores of Lake Superior, dwelt the Chippewas, or Ojibways, famed for their physical strength and prowess and living in their conical wigwams, with poles stuck in the ground in a circle and covered over with birch bark or grass mats. The Jesuit Fathers early found them in possession of the Sault Ste Marie and when General Wayne at the treaty of Greenville, reserved the post of Michilimackinac and certain lands on the main between Lake Michigan and Lake Huron, Mash-i-pinash-i-wish, one of the principal Chippewa chieftains, voluntarily made the United States a present of the island De Bois Blanch, at the eastern entrance of the straits of Mackinac, for their use and accommodation, and was highly complimented by the general for his generous gift.²⁴ A reference to the maps of Thomas G. Bradford, of 1838, shows the whole upper peninsula of Michigan in the possession of the Chippewas, as well as the whole southern and western shores of Lake Superior, and a large portion of northern Wisconsin.²⁵ One of their principal sources of food supply was wild rice, and the presence of this cereal, together with the plentiful supply of fish, probably accounts for their numbers and strength. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, they expelled the Foxes from northern Wisconsin and later drove the fierce Sioux beyond the Mississippi.²⁶ They were the undisputed masters of a very extensive domain and held it with a strong and powerful hand. One of their chiefs proudly said to Wayne:

Your brothers present, of the three fires, are gratified in seeing and hearing you; those who are at home will not experience that pleasure, until you come and live among us; you will then learn our title to that land.²⁷

²³ James R. Albach, *Annals of West*, 184.

²⁴ *American State Papers. Indian Affairs.* I, 577.

²⁵ Thomas G. Bradford, *Atlas of United States*, 1838, 16, 99, 156.

²⁶ Bureau of American Ethnology, *Handbook of American Indians.* I, Part I, page 278.

²⁷ *American State Papers. Indian Affairs.* I, 577.

Though far removed from the theatre of the wars of the northwest, they, together with the Ottawas, early came under the British influence, and resisted the efforts of the United States to subdue the Miamis and their confederate tribes, fighting with the allies against Col. Harmer at the Miami towns, against St. Clair, on the headwaters of the Wabash and against Anthony Wayne at Fallen Timbers on the twentieth of August, 1794.²⁸

The rudest of all the tribes of the northwest were the Ottawas, those expert canoe men of the Great Lakes, known to the French as the "traders", because they carried on a large trade and commerce between the other tribes. They seem to have had their original home on Mantoulin island, in Lake Huron, and on the north and south shores of the Georgian bay. Driven by terror of the Iriquois to the region west of Lake Michigan, they later returned to the vicinity of L'Arbe Croche, near the lower end of Lake Michigan, and from thence spread out in all directions. Consulting Bradford's map of 1838 again, the Ottawas are found in the whole northern end of the lower Michigan peninsula. Ottawa county, at the mouth of Grand river, would seem to indicate that at one time their towns must have existed in that vicinity, and in fact their possessions are said to have extended as far down the eastern shore of Lake Michigan as the St. Joseph. To the south and east of these points "their villages alternated with those of their old allies, the Hurons, now called Wyandot, along the shore of lake Erie from Detroit to the vicinity of Beaver Creek in Pennsylvania."²⁹ They were parties with the Wyandots and Delawares and other tribes to the treaty at Fort Harmer, Ohio, at the mouth of the Muskingum in 1789, whereby the Wyandots ceded large tracts of land in the southern part of that state to the United States government and were granted in turn the possession and occupancy of certain lands to the south of Lake Erie. The Ottawa title to any land in southern Ohio, however, is exceedingly doubtful and they were probably admitted as parties to the above treaty in deference to their acknowl-

²⁸ The Fort Wayne Manuscript. Annotated by Hiram Beckwith. State Library. Pages 81, 84, 85.

²⁹ American Bureau of Ethnology. *Handbook of American Indians*. I, Part 2, 170.

edged overlords, the Wyandots. Their long intercourse with the latter tribe, who were the most chivalrous, brave and intelligent of all the tribes, seems to have softened their manners and rendered them less ferocious than formerly. Like the Chippewas, their warriors were of fine physical mould, and Col. William Stanley Hatch, an early historian of Ohio, in writing of the Shawnees, embraces the following reference to the Ottawas:

As I knew them, (i. e., the Shawnees), they were truly noble specimens of their race, universally of fine athletic forms, and light complexion, none more so, and none appeared their equal, unless it was their tribal relatives, the Ottaways, who adjoined them. The warriors of these tribes were the finest looking Indians I ever saw, and were truly noble specimens of the human family.³⁰

The leading warriors and chieftains of their tribe, however, were great lovers of strong liquor, and Pontiac, the greatest of all the Ottawas, was assassinated shortly after a drunken carousal, and while he was singing the grand medicine songs of his race.³¹ Opposite the old French town of Detroit were two Indian villages, one of the Wyandots and another of the Ottawas. These towns were observed by Croghan in 1765. After Braddock's defeat, Colonel James Smith, then a young man and a captive among the Wyandots, was in attendance at the Wyandot village with a party of Indian hunters, who were trading beaver skins for arms, ammunition, blankets and trinkets. Here is his account of what occurred:

At length a trader came to town with French brandy. We purchased a keg of it, and held a council about who was to get drunk, and who was to keep sober, I was invited to get drunk, but I refused the proposal. Then they told me I must be one of those who were to take care of the drunken people. I did not like this, but of the two evils I chose that which I thought was the least, and fell in with those who were to conceal the arms, and keep every dangerous weapon we could, out of their way, and endeavor, if possible, to keep the drinking club from killing each other, which was a very hard task. Several times we hazarded our own lives, and got ourselves hurt, in preventing them from slaying each other. Before they had finished the keg, near one-third of the town was introduced to this drinking club; they could not pay their part, as they had already disposed of all their skins; but they made no odds, all were welcome to drink.

³⁰ Hatch, *A Chapter of the History of the War of 1812*, 92, 93, 94.

³¹ Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, 310.

When they were done with this keg, they applied to the traders, and procured a kettle full of brandy at a time, which they divided out with a large wooden spoon—and so they went on and never quit whilst they had a single beaver skin.

When the trader had got all our beaver, he moved off to the Ottawa town, about a mile above the Wiandot town.

When the brandy was gone, and the drinking club sober, they appeared much dejected. Some of them were crippled, others badly wounded. A number of the fine new shirts tore, and several blankets burned. A number of squaws were also in this club, and neglected their corn planting.

We could now hear the effects of the brandy in the Ottawa town. They were singing and yelling in the most hideous manner, both night and day; but their frolic ended worse than ours; five Ottawas were killed, and a great many wounded.³²

The Winnebagoes, while not listed with the seven confederated tribes who fought General Wayne, were discovered by the Jesuits in the neighborhood of Green Bay, Wisconsin, and the territory around the Fox and Wisconsin rivers and lake Winnebago has always been identified as the Winnebago country.

But the wandering Ishmaelites of all the north-west tribes were the Shawnees. Cruel, crafty and treacherous, and allied always with the English, they took a leading part in all the ravages and depredations on the frontiers of Pennsylvania and Virginia during the Revolution and led expedition after expedition against the infant settlements of Kentucky, from the period of the first pioneers in 1775, until Wayne's victory in 1794. These were the Indians who kept Boone in captivity, made Simon Kenton run the gauntlet, stole thousands of horses in Kentucky, and who for years attacked the flat boats and keel boats that floated down the Ohio, torturing their captives by burning at the stake.

Says General Harrison:

No fact, in relation to the Indian tribes, who have resided on the northwest frontier for a century past, is better known, than that the Shawnees came from Florida and Georgia about the middle of the eighteenth century. They passed through Kentucky (along the Cumberland river) on their way to the Ohio. But that their passage was rather a rapid one, is proved by these circumstances. Black Hoof, their late

³² An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the life and travels of Colonel James Smith. Written by himself. Lexington, 1799. Re-published by Clarke & Co., pages 75, 76, 77.

principal chief (with whom I had been acquainted since the Treaty of Greenville), was born in Florida, before the removal of his tribe. He died at Wapocconata, in this state, only three or four years ago. As I do not know his age, at the time of his leaving Florida, nor at his death, I am not able to fix with precision the date of the emigration. But it is well known that they were at the town which still bears their name on the Ohio, (Shawneetown, Ill.) a few miles below the mouth of the Wabash, some time before the commencement of the Revolutionary war; that they remained there some years before they removed to the Scioto where they were found by Governor Dunmore, in the year 1774. That their removal from Florida was a matter of necessity, and their progress from thence, a flight, rather than a deliberate march, is evident from their appearance, when they presented themselves upon the Ohio, and claimed the protection of the Miamis. They are represented by the chiefs of the latter, as well as those of the Delawares, as supplicants for protection, not against the Iriquois, but against the Creeks and Seminoles, or some other southern tribe, who had driven them from Florida, and they are said to have been literally *sans provat et sans culottes*.³³

Later writers have maintained that while they originally dwelt in the south, that one division of the tribe lived in South Carolina, while another and more numerous division lived along the Cumberland river and had a large village near the present site of Nashville. The Cumberland river was known on the early maps preceding the Revolution as the Shawnee river, while the Tennessee was called the Cherokee river. This Cumberland division is said to have become engaged in war with both the Cherokees and Chickasaws,³⁴ and to have fled to the north to receive the protection of the powerful nations of the Wabash.

Notwithstanding the magnanimous conduct of the Miamis, however, they, together with the Wyandots of Ohio, always regarded the Shawnees with suspicion and as trouble-makers. The great chief of the Miamis told Antoine Gamelin at Kekionga in April, 1790, when Gamelin was sent by the government to pacify the Wabash Indians, that the Miamis had incurred a bad name on account of mischief done along the Ohio, but that this was the work of the Shawnees, who, he said, had "a bad heart," and were the "perturbators of all

³³ Aborigines of the Ohio Valley. W. H. Harrison. State Library, Pages 29 and 30.

³⁴ Bureau of American Ethnology. *Handbook of American Indians*. I, Part 2, 534, 535.

³⁵ Dillon *History of Indiana*. I, 248.

the nations.”³⁵ To the articles of the treaty at Fort Harmar, in 1789, the following is appended:

That the Wyandots have laid claim to the lands that were granted to the Shawanese, (these lands were along the Miami, in Ohio), at the treaty held at the Miami, and have declared, that as the Shawanese have been so restless, and caused so much trouble, both to them and to the United States, if they will not now be at peace, they will dispossess them, and take the country into their own hands; for that country is theirs of right, and the Shawanese are only living upon it by their permission.³⁶

From the recital of the above facts, it is evident that the Shawnees could never justly claim the ownership of any of the lands north of the Ohio. That, far from being the rightful sovereigns of the soil, they came to the valleys of the Miamis and Wyandots as refugees from a devastating war, and as supplicants for protection and mercy. This is recognized by the Quaker, Henry Harvey, who was partial to them and for many years dwelt among them as a missionary. Harvey says that from the accounts of the various treaties to which they were parties, “they had been disinherited altogether, as far as related to the ownership of land anywhere.”³⁷ Yet from the lips of the most famous of all the Shawnees, came the false but specious reasoning that none of the tribes of the northwest, not even the Miamis who had received and sheltered them, had a right to alienate any of their lands without the common consent of all.

That no single tribe had the right to sell; that the power to sell was not vested in their chief, but must be the act of the warriors in council assembled of all the tribes, as the land belonged to all—no portion of it to any single tribe.³⁸

This doctrine of communistic ownership was advocated by Tecumseh in the face of all the conquests of the Iroquois, in the face of the claim of the Wyandots to much of the domain of the present state of Ohio, and in the face of all of Little Turtle’s claims to the Maumee and the Wabash valleys, founded on long and undisputed occupancy and possession. It never had any authority, either in fact or in history, and moreover, lacked the great and saving grace of originality.

³⁵ Henry Harvey *History of the Shawnee Indians, From the Year 1681 to 1854, Inclusive*, 164.

³⁶ John Law, *History of Vincennes*, 81.

³⁷ United States Statutes at Large. Indian Treaties. Boston, 1856, Page 32.

The truth is that this Shawnee pretension was based wholly and solely on the arguments of the British agents and officers at Detroit, who long after the Revolution, retained the frontier posts and forts in the northwest territory contrary to the terms of the treaty of peace of 1783, in order to save the British traders and merchants the valuable traffic in beaver skins and peltries, and to that end, organized the tribes of the northwest into a confederacy to resist the advances of the American settlers into the Indian domain. If these British agents could, as they did in the fall of 1788,³⁹ assemble all the tribes in the valley of the Maumee and there have them resolve "that no bargain or sale of any part of these Indian lands would be considered as valid or binding, unless agreed to by general council", then it is plain to see where this doctrine of the common ownership of the Indian lands originated. By pointing to the purchasers of the lands north of the Ohio, and to the settlers of Kentucky, the English played on the jealousies of the ignorant savages, alienated their affections from the United States government, and plied them with arguments to dispute the validity of every treaty, either at Fort Harmar, or elsewhere, whereby the government had acquired the title to any of the Indian lands, no matter how indefeasible the title of the Indian grantors at those treaties had been. When Benjamin Lincoln, Beverly Randolph and Timothy Pickering, commissioners on behalf of the United States to make peace with the Indians of the northwest, in the year 1793, reproached Colonel Simcoe, commander of the King's forces, in upper Canada, with having advised the Indians to make peace with the United States, "but not to give up any of their lands", Simcoe boldly replied that it was the principle of the British Government, "to unite the American Indians, that all petty jealousies being extinguished, the real wishes of the several tribes may be expressed, and in consequence all the treaties made with them, may have the most complete ratification and universal concurrence," and, "that a jealousy of a contrary conduct in the agents of the United States appears to him (Simcoe) to have been deeply impressed upon the minds of the confederacy."⁴⁰

³⁹ Dillon *History of Indiana*, 351.

⁴⁰ Dillon *History of Indiana*, 332.

This is the true background and setting of that far famed land policy, originating in the councils of the British Board of Trade whose mercenary motives controlled the English colonial policy, and who were bold enough to attempt to control both the lands and the subjects of an independent nation, and bring on a savage warfare, in order to gain a commercial advantage.

The savage warriors of the northwest were not formidable in numbers, but they were terrible in their ferocity, their knowledge of wood-craft and their cunning strategy. General Harrison says that for a decade prior to the Treaty of Greenville, the allied tribes could not at any time have brought into the field over three thousand warriors. This statement is corroborated by Col. James Smith, who had an intimate knowledge of the Wyandots and other tribes, and who says:

I am of the opinion that from Braddock's war, until the present time (1799), there never were more than three thousand Indians at any time, in arms against us, west of Fort Pitt, and frequently not half that number.⁴¹

Constant warfare with the colonies and the Kentucky and Virginia hunting-shirt men had greatly reduced their numbers, but above all the terrible ravages of smallpox, which they had no means of combating, had carried away thousands and reduced the ranks of their valiant armies.

Woe to the general, however who lightly estimated their fighting qualities, or thought that these "rude and undisciplined" savages, as they were sometimes called, could be met and overpowered by the tactics of the armies of Europe or America! They were, says Harrison, "a body of the finest light-troops in the world,"⁴² and this opinion is corroborated by Theodore Roosevelt, who had some first-hand knowledge of Indian fighters. The Wyandots and Miamis, especially, as well as other western bands, taught the males of their tribes the arts of war from their earliest youth. When old enough to bear arms, they were disciplined to act in concert, to obey punctually all commands, and cheerfully unite to put them

⁴¹ James Smith, *An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Col. James Smith. Written by himself.* 154.

⁴² W. H. Harrison, *Aborigines of the Ohio Valley*, 38.

into immediate execution. Each warrior was taught to observe carefully the motion of his right-hand companion, so as to communicate any sudden movement or command from the right to the left. Thus advancing in perfect accord, they could march stealthily and abreast through the thick woods and underbrush, in scattered order, without losing the conformation of their ranks or creating disorder. These manoeuvres could be executed slowly or as fast as the warriors could run. They were also disciplined to form a circle, a semi-circle or a hollow square. They used the circle to surround their enemies, the semi-circle, if the enemy had a stream on one side or in the rear, and the hollow square in case of sudden attack, when they were in danger of being surrounded. By forming a square and taking to trees, they put their faces to the enemy in every direction and lessened the danger of being shot from behind objects on either side.⁴³

The principal sachem of a village was seldom the war-chief in charge of an expedition. War-chiefs were selected with an eye solely to their skill and ability; to entrust the care and direction of an army to an inexperienced leader was unheard of. One man, however, was never entrusted with the absolute command of an army. A general council of the principal officers was held, and a plan concerted for an attack. Such a council was held before the battle of Fallen Timbers, in which Blue Jacket, of the Shawnees, Little Turtle of the Miamis, and other celebrated leaders participated. The plan thus concerted was scrupulously carried out. It was the duty of the war-chief to animate his warriors by speeches and orations before the battle. During the battle he directed their movements by prearranged signals or a shout or yell, and thus ordered the advance or retreat. The warriors who crept through the long grasses of the swamp lands at Tippecanoe to attack the army of Harrison were directed by the rattling of dried deer hoofs.

It was a part of the tactics practiced by the war-chiefs to inflict the greatest possible damage upon the enemy, with the loss of as few of their own men as possible. They were never to bring on an attack without some considerable advantage,

⁴³ *Remarkable Occurrences, etc.* 150.

"or without what appeared to them the sure prospect of victory." If, after commencing an engagement, it became apparent that they could not win the conflict without a great sacrifice of men, they generally abandoned it, and waited for a more favorable opportunity. This was not the result of cowardice, for Harrison says that their bravery and valor was unquestioned. It may have been largely the result of a savage superstition not to force the decrees of Fate. Says Harrison:

It may be fairly considered as having its source in that peculiar temperament of mind, which they often manifested, of not pressing fortune under any sinister circumstances, but patiently waiting until the chances of a successful issue appeared to be favorable.⁴⁴

When the Great Spirit was not angry, he would again favor his children.

One tribe among the warriors of the northwest, however, were taught from their earliest youth never to retreat; to regard "submission to an enemy as the lowest degradation", and to "consider anything that had the appearance of an acknowledgment of the superiority of an enemy as disgraceful." These were the Wyandots, the acknowledged superiors in the northwestern confederacy. "In the battle of the Miami Rapids, of thirteen chiefs of that tribe, who were present, only one survived, and he badly wounded."⁴⁵

The well known policy of the savages to ambush or out-flank their enemies was well known to Washington. He warned St. Clair of this terrible danger in the Indian country, but his advice went unheeded. A pre-concerted attack might occur on the front ranks of an advancing column, and almost immediately spread to the flanks. This occurred at Braddock's defeat. The glittering army of redcoats, so much admired by Washington, with drums beating and flags flying, forded the Monongahela and ascended the banks of the river between two hidden ravines. Suddenly they were greeted by a terrible fire on the front ranks, which almost immediately spread to the right flank, and then followed a horrible massacre of huddled troops, who fired volleys of musketry at an

⁴⁴ W. H. Harrison, *Aborigines of the Ohio Valley*. 39.

⁴⁵ W. H. Harrison, *Aborigines of the Ohio Valley*. 39.

invisible foe, and then miserably perished.⁴⁶ When St. Clair started his ill-fated march upon the Miami towns in 1791, his movements were observed every instant of time by the silent scouts and runners of the Miamis. Camping on the banks of the upper Wabash, and foolishly posting his militia far in the front, he suddenly saw them driven back in confusion upon his regulars, his lines broken by attacks on both flanks, and his artillery silenced to the last gun. The attack was so well planned, so sudden, and so furious, that nothing remained but precipitate and disastrous retreat. Out of an army consisting of fourteen hundred men and eighty-six officers, eight hundred and ninety men and sixteen officers were killed and wounded.⁴⁷ St. Clair believed that he had been "overpowered by numbers," and so reported to the government. "It was alleged by the officers," says Judge Burnet, "that the Indians far outnumbered the American troops. That conclusion was drawn, in part, from the fact that they outflanked and attacked the American lines with great force, and at the same time on every side."⁴⁸ The truth is, that St. Clair was completely outwitted by the admirable cunning and strategy of Little Turtle, the Miami, who concerted the plan of attack, and directed its operation. Nor is it at all likely that the Indians had a superior force. They often attacked superior numbers, if they enjoyed the better fighting position, or could take advantage of an ambush or surprise. A very respectable authority, who has the endorsement of historians, says:

There was an army of Indians composed of Miamis, Pottawatimies, Ottoways, Chippawas, Wyandotts, Delawares, Shawanoes, and a few Mingoes and Cherokees, amounting in all to eleven hundred and thirty-three, that attacked and defeated General St. Clair on the 4th of November, 1791. Each nation was commanded by their own chiefs, all of whom were governed by the Little Turtle, who made the arrangement for the action and commenced the attack with the Miamis, who were under his immediate command. The Indians had thirty killed and died with their wounds the day of the action, and fifty wounded.⁴⁹

Of such formidable mould, were the red men of the northwest, who went into battle stripped to the skin, and with

⁴⁶ J. R. Albach, *Annals of West.* 129-137.

⁴⁷ James R. Albach, *Annals of West.* 585.

⁴⁸ Henry Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio.* 129.

⁴⁹ The Fort Wayne Manuscript. 84.

bodies painted with horrible stripes of vermilion. So disastrous had been the result of their victories over the armies of Harmar and St. Clair, and so illy equipped with men, money and supplies was the infant government of the United States, that immediately prior to the campaign of General Anthony Wayne, a military conference was held between President Washington, General Knox, Secretary of War, and General Wayne, to devise a system of military tactics that should thereafter control in the conduct of all wars against the Indians of the northwest.

The development of this system of tactics has been outlined by General William Henry Harrison, who was an aide to Wayne, in a personal letter to Mann Butler, one of the historians of Kentucky.

It was determined that in all future contests with the tribes, that the troops employed should, when in the Indian country, be moved in such manner as that the order of march could be immediately converted, by simple evolution, into an order of battle. In other words, that the troops while actually in the line of march could be almost instantly formed in lines of battle. This was to prevent any sudden or unexpected attack, and this was always liable to occur in a thickly wooded country. The troops were also to be taught to march in open formation, each file to be more than an arm's length from those on the right and left. The old European system of fighting men shoulder to shoulder was entirely impracticable in a wilderness of woods, for it invited too great a slaughter, interfered with the movements of the troops, and shortened the lines. The great object of the Indian tactics was always to flank their enemy, therefore an extension of the lines was highly desirable when entering into action.

In fighting Indians there was no shock to be given or received, and a very open order was therefore attended with two very great advantages; it more than doubled the length of the lines, and in charging, which was an essential part of the system, it gave more facility to get through the obstacles which an action in the woods presented.

A system was also developed whereby, in case the Indians attempted to flank the army, they were met by a succession of fresh troops coming from the rear to extend the lines. When encamped, the troops were to assume the form of a hollow

square, with the baggage and cavalry, and sometimes the light infantry and riflemen, in the center. A rampart of logs was to be placed around the camp to prevent a sudden night attack, and to give the troops time to get under arms, but this rampart was not intended as a means of defense in daylight.

To defeat Indians by regular troops, the charge must be relied upon; the fatality of a contest at long shot, with their accurate aim and facility of covering themselves, was mournfully exhibited in the defeats of Braddock and St. Clair. General Wayne used no patrols, no picket guards. In Indian warfare they would always be cut off; and if that were not the case, they would afford no additional security to the army, as Indians do not require roads to enable them to advance upon an enemy. For the same reason (that they would be killed or taken) patrols were rejected, and reliance for safety was entirely placed upon keeping the army always ready for action. In connection with this system of constant preparation, there was only a chain of sentinels around the camp, furnished by the camp guards, who were placed within supporting distance.⁵⁰

The outline and adoption of this system of tactics shows that both Washington and Anthony Wayne were fully aware of the dangerous nature of their savage adversaries; that they had a wholesome respect for both their woodcraft and military discipline, and that they regarded the conquest of the western wilderness as a task requiring great circumspection and military genius.

⁵⁰ History of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Mann Butler. Louisville, 1834. Pages 216, 217, 218.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Rare Books on American and Indiana History for Sale

Terrell's Reports—Indiana in the Civil War, 8 vols.	\$8.00
Banta, Historical Sketch of Johnson County	1.00
Indiana's Roll of Honor, Civil War, Vol. 1	2.00
The Indiana Soldier—Civil War—2 vols.	4.00
Streightoff, Indiana, A Social and Economic Survey	1.00
Moore, Hoosier Cyclopedia	1.00
Wylie, Indiana University 1828-1890	1.00
Harding, Indiana University 1828-1904	1.00
Dye—Some Torch Bearers of Indiana	1.00
Woodburn, Higher Education in Indiana	1.00
Clark's Campaign in Illinois—Pirtle	1.50
Henry, Political Platforms of Indiana	1.00
Moore, History of Hanover College	1.00
Young, History of Wayne County	1.00
Dunn, Indiana	1.00
Howe, The Great West	1.00
Legislative and State Manual, set	8.00
Woodburn, Hall's New Purchase	1.25
Dillon, History of Indiana	7.50
Burnet, Notes of the Northwest Territory	5.00
Foulke, Life of Morton, 2 vols.	5.00
Monks, Courts and Lawyers of Indiana, 3 vols.	15.00
Sweet, Circuit Rider Days in Indiana	1.50
Levering, Historic Indiana	2.00
Howe, Historical Collections of Ohio, 2 vols.	3.00
Thayer, Life of John Hay, 2 vols.	4.00
Strickland, Autobiography of Peter Cartwright	1.00
Moore, Life of Schuyler Colfax	1.50
Thompson, Stories of Indiana	1.00
Shirts, Primitive History of Hamilton County	1.50
Eggleston, First of the Hoosiers	1.00
Harrison, This Country of Ours	1.00
Blaine, Twenty Years of Congress, 2 vols.	5.00
Dunn, True Indian Stories	1.00
Brevier Reports, per vol.	.50

ADDRESS THIS MAGAZINE

A HISTORY OF INDIANA

From Its Exploration To 1918

In two volumes, 1,120 pages.

BY

LOGAN ESAREY, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Western History in Indiana University

VOL. I.

- I THE FRENCH IN INDIANA.
- II THE ENGLISH PERIOD, 1764-1779.
- III THE CONQUEST OF VIRGINIA.
- IV CLOSING CAMPAIGNS OF THE REVOLUTION.
- V INDIAN WARS, 1790-1796.
- VI GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY.
- VII INDIANA TERRITORY, 1800-1816.
- VIII INDIANA AND THE WAR OF 1812.
- IX FROM TERRITORY TO STATE.
- X THE STATE GOVERNMENT AT CORYDON, 1816-1825.
- XI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1825-1835.
- XII RELIGION AND EDUCATION IN EARLY INDIANA.
- XIII POLITICS FROM 1825 TO 1840.
- XIV REMOVAL OF THE INDIANS FROM THE STATE.
- XV THE PUBLIC LAND IN INDIANA.
- XVI SYSTEMATIC INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.
- XVII THE SECOND BANK IN INDIANA.
- XVIII THE PIONEERS AND THEIR SOCIAL LIFE.
- XIX THE MEXICAN WAR.
- XX THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1850.
- XXI POLITICS FROM 1840 TO 1852.

VOL. II.

- XXII INDIANA IN THE FIFTIES.
- XXIII CIVIL WAR POLITICS.
- XXIV THE COMMON SCHOOLS.
- XXV BUILDING THE RAILROADS.
- XXVI RECONSTRUCTION.
- XXVIII AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.
- XXIX GREENBACKS AND GRANGERS.
- XXX MINING.
- XXXI STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM.
- XXXII THE TARIFF QUESTION.
- XXXIII THE INDIANA CITIES.
- XXXIV THE COLLEGES.
- XXXV COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT.
- XXXVI POPULISTS, SOCIALISTS AND PROGRESSIVES.
- XXXVII MILITARY HISTORY SINCE THE CIVIL WAR.
- XXXVIII LITERARY HISTORY.


"Prof. Logan Esarey, of Indiana University, has written the History of Indiana from its earliest exploration to 1918. No man in the middle west is better equipped to perform this splendid task for the Hoosier commonwealth."

L. N. HINES, *State Supt. Elect.*

PRICE PER SET, POSTPAID \$8.00. SINGLE VOLUME \$4.00

Sent on approval to libraries. Address
all communications to

LOGAN ESAREY,
Bloomington, Indiana.



INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

CONTENTS

Page

THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY IN INDIANA.....*Carl P. Foster* 171

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.00 PER YEAR SINGLE COPY, 50 CENTS

Approved as second-class matter September 10, 1913, at the postoffice at
Bloomington, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Bound Volumes of this Magazine since 1914
can be furnished by the publishers at
\$3.00, postpaid.

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COOPERATION OF

THE INDIANA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

THE INDIANA STATE LIBRARY

BOARD OF EDITORS

JAMES A. WOODBURN, PH.D., Professor of American History
and Politics, Indiana University

SAMUEL B. HARDING, PH. D.

GEORGE S. COTTMAN, Former Editor, Madison

WILLIAM O. LYNCH, A.M., Professor of History, Indiana State
Normal School

HARLOW LINDLEY, A.M., State Archivist, Professor of History,
Earlham College

JACOB P. DUNN, LL.B., Secretary Indiana Historical Society

DEMARCHUS C. BROWN, A.M., State Librarian

LOGAN ESAREY, PH. D., Managing Editor

Associate Professor of Western History, Indiana University

Subscription Price, \$2.00 per year.

Single Number, 50 Cents.

Copyright, 1920, by
Indiana University

INDIANA

MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

VOL. XVI

SEPTEMBER, 1920

No. 3

The Progressive Party In Indiana

By CARL PAINTER, A. M.

Book page 10
The progressive movement in Indiana was simply a component part of the larger movement throughout the nation. It was broader than any political party, and embodied many fundamental measures and principles of political, social and economic reforms common to the platforms of parties for the preceding half century. The Republican party at its inception was prophetic of progressiveism. It undertook to introduce positive economic and social functions into the American government.¹ However, after a long lease of power, during which its supremacy was never seriously disputed, corrupt practices had crept in.

For some time there had been Republicans who stood for a change in their party's leadership. These men wanted it to be more responsive to the will of the people at all times. There was a feeling that the government with its privileges belonged to those who best knew how to manage votes and voters. Corruption in state and local politics grew. There was little public protest. A long period of indifferentism followed. The old story of the man who was enraged because a corruptionist was sure to be elected mayor, yet stayed away from the polls because he had an engagement to go quail hunting, illustrates the attitude of many. Under such circumstances it became possible for political bosses to control elections in their own interests. Some of the earlier progressive Republicans were Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin who was defeated as a candidate for governor of that state in 1894. Later, in 1900 he was elected to that

¹ Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 123.

office, and re-elected in 1902 and 1904. In Michigan Hazen S. Pingree was elected mayor of Detroit in 1889 and governor of Michigan in 1896. He instituted many radical changes within his jurisdiction. Tom L. Johnson as mayor of Cleveland and Samuel M. Jones as mayor of Toledo initiated certain movements in their respective cities looking toward the amelioration of the poorer classes as well as the comfort and welfare of all.

The Democratic party was not unlike the Republican party in its corruption and failure to measure up to the demand of the times. As in the Republican party, there were certain pioneer Progressive Democrats who because of their revolt against the old processes in state and local government helped to make the way easier for the later Progressive movement as an independent party. Among these the most prominent were William S. U'Ren and George E. Chamberlain of Oregon. Joseph W. Folk started "the fight for Missouri" in 1900 which he continued as governor in 1904.

The smaller third parties had from time to time announced their principles, practically all of which were taken up by the Progressive party.

Some of their platform planks were woman suffrage, direct election of United States senators, abolition of child labor, initiative, referendum and recall, non-partisan tariff commission, income tax, inheritance tax, regulation of railway rates, control of monopolies, mothers' pensions, minimum wage laws, preferential primaries, factory regulation and inspection, employer's liability, workmen's compensation, state insurance acts, home rule for cities, postal savings banks and government ownership of certain public utilities.

With the succession of Theodore Roosevelt to the presidency a union of the man and the occasion was consummated. It made possible the launching of the Progressive movement on a national scale. The policy of legislative control of the great corporations was begun, and at the same time illegal combinations were prosecuted under the Sherman Anti-trust act of 1890. The national movement extended its authority to the settlement of labor disputes, railroad regulation, pure food, meat inspection, and the great undertaking for the con-

servation of our natural resources. Roosevelt's bold and fearless administration coupled with his striking personality made him the idol of a majority in his party.

As president, William H. Taft, in order to realize a successful administration, needed only to gather up the spoils of victory which his predecessor had already won for him.

The Republican reactionaries in congress had longed for the end of Roosevelt's term to come, counting the days until his successor would be inaugurated. It was doubtless Mr. Taft's intentions to keep in between the two factions of his party, and in his failure to give his aid to the Progressives he alienated them. To them it seemed clear that he had fallen entirely into the hands of the conservatives.² For the ordinary administrative duties of the presidential office Taft was a good man, but along the new lines of governmental activity he failed to make good. It seemed that he always did the wrong thing at the wrong time although perhaps unintentionally.

While there were Progressives in all parties the Republican party was the only one to experience an open rupture. The first evidence of division was in the house of representatives during the special session of congress, March, 1909. At this time the "insurgents" as they were called, arrayed themselves against Speaker Joseph G. Cannon. "Uncle Joe" was accused of exercising arbitrary power and of holding back desirable legislation.³

The Republican party had been returned to power in 1908 with the promise in its platform that the tariff would be revised. It was generally understood that revision meant a reduction on most schedules. The House tariff bill was amended by the finance committee of the Senate in a way that made it unsatisfactory to senators from the west. On the final vote ten of these senators voted against the bill.⁴ All of these senators save Brown, Burkett and Crawford continued to oppose the bill as amended by the conference committee. President Taft had used his influence to bring about

² Haworth, *America in Ferment*, 376.

³ *American Year Book*, 1910, 49.

⁴ Beveridge of Indiana, Bristow of Kansas, Brown and Burkett of Nebraska, Clapp of Minnesota, Crawford of South Dakota, Cummins and Dolliver of Iowa, La Follette of Wisconsin and Nelson of Minnesota.

an improvement in the bill but finally signed it. The Progressive Republicans felt that he should have helped them more. They therefore speedily severed relationship with him when he declared that the tariff measure was "the best that had ever been passed."⁵

An outstanding feature of the off year elections in 1910 was the schism in the Republican party. Six normally Republican states elected Democratic governors. The Democrats gained control of the house of representatives by a majority of 64. In the Senate they were only outnumbered by eight. It was obvious that most of the Republican strength had been due to progressive assistance. The elections clearly rebuked the Republican "standpatter" and indicated that the voters supported the progressive position.

As the break grew wider the Progressives formed a definite organization. On January 23, 1911, the Progressive Republican League was started in Washington "to promote popular government and progressive legislation."⁶ At this time five reforms were advocated: (1) Direct election of United States senators, (2) direct primaries for nomination of all elective officials, (3) direct election of delegates to national convention, (4) amending state constitutions to provide for initiative, referendum, and recall, (5) a thoroughgoing corrupt practices act. Senator Jonathan Bourne was made president of the league. Other leading members were Senators La Follette, Cummins, Bristow, Brown, Clapp, Gronna, Beveridge; governors of California, Michigan, Nebraska, Wisconsin and Wyoming; Gifford Pinchot, James R. Garfield, and Louis D. Brandeis. The league showed its political importance when in the reorganization of the Senate it demanded a representation in the Republican committees at a ratio of one to four. Such assignments were to be made by La Follette, Cummins, Bourne and Bristow, Progressive members of the Republican steering committee in the upper house. In spite of Republican protest the Progressives virtually acted as a third party during the special session from April to August, 1911. They opposed Canadian reciprocity, but voted for the Democratic measures including the farmers' free list,

⁵ President Taft's speech at Winona, Minn., Sept., 1909.

⁶ *American Year Book*, 1911, 68.

cotton and wool bills. After Taft vetoed the three tariff measures about two-thirds of the Progressives formed a coalition with the House Democrats in an unsuccessful attempt to pass the free list and woolen bills over the veto.⁷

During the summer the leading Progressive Republicans continued to attack the President in various public utterances. He was accused of being too friendly to the large corporations. Moreover, the attitude he took toward the Payne-Aldrich bill, Canadian reciprocity and his conservation policy was generally condemned.⁸ On the sixteenth of October about two hundred Progressive Republicans met at Chicago, drew up a set of resolutions and endorsed Senator La Follette for the presidency.⁹ Senator La Follette had before this time opened up headquarters in Washington. Walter L. Hauser, secretary of the Progressive Republican League was in charge as his field secretary. At the conference two facts appeared. First, men only waited the formal word to line up behind La Follette as against Taft. Second, no "pussy-foot" platform of principles, as several speakers expressed, would be countenanced by the aggressive men gathered together under the banner of progressivism.¹⁰ The selection of a presidential candidate by a direct primary vote was one of the noteworthy resolutions.¹¹ The action of the Chicago conference was not approved by a number of Indiana Republicans. The Indianapolis *Star* in an editorial, October 20, termed the resolution a "surrender" because they did not mention tariff reform. The use of such terms as "safe and stable," "judicial determination," were re-

⁷ *American Year Book*, 1911, 49, 52, 69.

⁸ Haynes, *Third Party Movements*, 424.

⁹ Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 17, 1911.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ "The progressive movement is a struggle to wrest the control of the government in the nation from the representatives of special privileges and restore it to the people. The issue is the same in all states though the problem may be presented in different ways. The present condition of uncertainty in business is intolerable and destructive of industrial prosperity. It is worse than idle to leave the question, whether government business enterprises are legal or not, merely to judicial determination. Industrial corporations should by affirmative legislative enactment be given definite rules of conduct by which business shall be made safe and stable while at the same time the interests of the public should be fully safeguarded. We favor the choice of a presidential candidate by direct primary in each state. Pursuant to statute or in its absence let the Republican state committees give the people this right."—Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 17, 1911.

ferred to as a means of enticing voters and not an offer of aggressive reform. The Progressive sentiment of the Republican party might have been gathered up and solidified by a correct statement of its views but the conference failed both in platform and candidate to accomplish this.

Republican sentiment in Indiana was still progressive, but it was not strong for La Follette. When some of the senator's boosters chose to abandon the impersonal fight for tariff and industrial reform and resolve the movement into a vehicle for his ambition they parted company with the rank and file in Indiana. Nevertheless, the devotees of "anything to beat Taft" were beginning to realize that, after all, the Payne-Aldrich bill was not the only thing that had happened in the last two years, nor the only thing that the people would be thinking of when they came to select a president. Further tariff reform might be undertaken during the winter session of congress. If no relief was granted on the woolen and cotton schedule the country would then understand who was to blame. Gradually public opinion was beginning to identify the president with other things. He could hardly be held responsible for the Payne act except as playing the part of "first aid to the injured" at Winona. La Follette, even, considered that the tariff was being overmuch discussed. To refrain from raising that issue would enable him to hold the farmer protectionist vote and not alienate those held by direct primaries, just as a trust plank of the Chicago resolutions would hold both Wall Street and the Populists. There were of course a few personal admirers of the Wisconsin senator in Indiana. In Wayne county the central committee decided not to entertain him should he make his proposed visit in November. It was argued that such a visit would be unprecedented and would embarrass the new county committee after the holidays by seeming to endorse a candidate in opposition to the President. La Follette's friends therefore declared that a Progressive party would be formed to entertain him and to help further his candidacy in that section. These men felt that Taft had already intimated his fear in an address at the Hamilton Club dinner in Chicago, October 30. He was reported to have said: "If the people

desire a change we shall loyally support the new government under any condition."¹²

In order to determine just who was the man most likely to defeat Mr. Taft's nomination the La Follette following urged the use of preferential primaries wherever possible. The Progressives planned to bring the matter up before the Republican national committee when it met in Washington, December 12, but since they could only command about six votes of the committee, the attempt was doomed to failure. The friends of the Wisconsin man however were expecting the coup to fail but contended that its failure would be a help rather than a hindrance. "Every knock a boost" was their slogan. By rejecting the scheme, Republican standpatters would be shown up. The only defense they offered was that any such change would cause confusion. Under the usual convention system they could control this election of delegates in favor of President Taft. At the Washington meeting of the national committee, December 12, the scheme was rejected, as predicted by the progressives. The spirit of the national body was decidedly pro-Taft. Harry S. New, as Indiana's member, was strongly opposed to the primary idea. After overcoming some slight opposition he was made chairman of the sub-committee to arrange for the national convention to be held in Chicago.

Indiana politics was not greatly influenced earlier in the year by the Progressive agitation in the neighboring states. According to Walter L. Hauser, La Follette's field secretary, the state was on the map for the "opening gun" in the presidential campaign of his leader. The gun was to be loaded, primed and fired for Indiana and by Indiana. Out of "senatorial courtesy" Indiana had been left alone by insurgents pending Beveridge's return from Europe. The future course of Progressivism in the state was still admittedly up to him.

At this time an unexpected statement by State Chairman Edwin M. Lee, that Taft could not carry Indiana, caused unusual political activity in the Hoosier state. Mr. Lee had been in New York and his statement was made in Washington after his arrival there, December 12. This left no doubt of the possibility of a fight being made in Indiana to prevent Taft instructions in the district conventions and in the state con-

¹²Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 31, 1911.

vention in connection with choosing district delegates and delegates at large to the national convention. Copies of the statement were eagerly sought for in the lobby of the Willard hotel where Mr. Lee was staying. Newspaper men heard that a sensation was on tap and flocked to the Indiana man. Republican State Chairman Walter Brown of Ohio had preceded Mr. Lee in declaring against the availability of Mr. Taft. With the impetus given the movement to prevent instructed delegates to the national convention it would now go on with considerable co-operation throughout the country. It was expected that an anti-Taft organization would be effected in Indiana within the following few weeks. Lee's statement was as follows:

Mr. Taft cannot carry Indiana. If he is the Republican nominee our fight is lost before a gun is fired. As one of his original friends I have been driven to this knowledge with extreme reluctance. I have hoped he would be the man to lead us next year and have personally declared for him three separate times. I have spent the last eight months traveling over Indiana, have visited each county in the state and some counties many times. For a time it looked as if we might pull Mr. Taft through and I fostered favorable sentiment to him wherever I could because I am his personal friend and it seemed logical and good party policy that he should succeed himself. From the first, however, I found no enthusiastic sentiment for him. The feeling of the precinct workers and the rank and file seemed to be one of suffering that he had the solid south and would be nominated and we might as well make the best of it. In the last two months sentiment has changed to pronounced dissatisfaction with Mr. Taft as our leader. A few days ago I sent letters to our precinct committeemen—there are more than three thousand of them—asking for a statement of political conditions in their precincts. I have received already hundreds of replies. Four out of five of these letters from precinct committeemen state that there is dissatisfaction with Mr. Taft among the voters, and this too although in my letter I did not ask for opinions on that point, but only on general conditions. This proves to me what my personal contact with our voters—and I have personally interviewed literally thousands of them in the last eight months—had led me to fear, there is not the slightest chance to carry Indiana for Mr. Taft.

The formation of a new Republican state committee in Indiana brought out the real cleavage of the members of that party. The issue was Taft instructions or an open field. Mr. Lee declared that on November 21 he had told President Taft

that it would be impossible to carry Indiana with him as the nominee. To national chairman Charles D. Hilles he stated that the use of federal patronage and the attempt to force activity of federal appointees in building up a Taft machine in Indiana would "result only in the promotion of additional factional feeling." Medill McCormick, returning to La Follette's headquarters in Washington from a tour of investigation in Indiana, declared that all the information he had been able to obtain tended to bear out the statement of Mr. Lee. When the state committee met to fix dates for the meetings in the districts to choose district members of the state committee, all conceded this would take place. Chairman Lee favored the second week in January for these meetings so that the anti-Taft sentiment would have time to grow. Some prominent Republicans of the state issued statements concerning Mr. Lee's actions.¹³ It was generally agreed that he desired

¹³ R. F. Davidson, President of the Marion Club, said: "President Taft's record justifies Indiana Republicans in favoring him and urging his re-nomination. It is my opinion and observation that President Taft's strength in Indiana is such as to insure him the solid Indiana delegation in the 1912 Republican National Convention and I believe when he is re-elected next fall Indiana will be one among the great states found backing Taft for four years more of sane and progressive administration."

John C. Ruckelshaus, avowed candidate for Republican district chairman in the Seventh district and former Marion county chairman, who already had declared his fealty to Taft, said: "I am not able to speak of conditions in the state as a whole, but so far as the Seventh district is concerned I believe President Taft is as strong as he ever was and that he will be the same strong candidate in 1912 that he was in 1908. President Taft proved to be remarkably vigorous as a vote getter in the county and district three years ago. So far as I am concerned no statements adverse to President Taft have any weight with me."

Former governor, Winfield T. Durbin, made the following statement in Chicago on December 13: "There is no doubt of President Taft being the nominee of the Republicans if his strength in Indiana is any criterion. He will get a solid delegation to the national convention and I want to say that if Indiana does not go Republican at the election there won't be anything Republican left anywhere else."

The *Evening Item*, Richmond, William W. Foulke's newspaper, said editorially: "There is nothing surprising about Mr. Lee's declaration. In fact he admitted on his visit to Richmond a few weeks ago that he found a pronounced apathy on President Taft's administration, and even in the face of his own preference that the party 'get together' behind Taft he confessed it seemed a forlorn hope."

Henry W. Bennett, Republican District Chairman of the Seventh district and vice-chairman of the Republican State Committee, said: "I am inclined to believe State Chairman Lee has given a fair statement of the Indiana situation so far as President Taft is concerned. I know Chairman Lee has investigated political conditions. No doubt he feels entirely justified in the statement of his conclusions based on conscientious inquiry. I do not believe it is the part

re-election as chairman of the state committee. Naturally he would not care to take charge of the campaign in his state for a candidate who had no chance of being elected. Zealous Taft men claimed that Lee was making the race for re-election on Roosevelt propaganda, that he was jealous because Taft had not made him United States marshal, or did not support his candidacy for re-election as state chairman. Combined forces of the friends of Charles W. Fairbanks, James B. Kealing, Captain Harry S. New, James A. Hemenway and James E. Watson of the old state organization lined up against Chairman Lee. They refused to admit the correctness of Mr. Lee's views as to Taft's strength in Indiana. While the state chairmanship at that time, December 17, was one of the chief things at issue in Republican party politics, the matter of instructions for the Indiana delegation to the Republican national convention was not entirely forgotten. Men on both sides of the organization contest asserted that it was altogether probable that when the time came the Indiana delegation would go forth uninstructed. Men who had in mind the uncertainties and possibilities of politics as well as the high standing of Charles W. Fairbanks as a presidential possibility were expected to insist upon non-instruction for an outside man. The Lee forces had not yet said much concerning this matter but it was understood that their efforts included the selection of national delegates as well as the naming of a new state committeeman for the party.

Chairman Lee issued a call January 2, 1912, to the various "functions" for the reorganization of the state committee. Delegates to the district conventions, to elect district chairmen and precinct committeemen, were to be elected January 26

of wisdom to overlook or put aside the feeling against Taft which seems to exist in Indiana."

Colonel Charles Arthur Carlisle, South Bend, an influential Republican of the Thirtieth district, said: "If Taft cannot carry Indiana no Republican can, and we might just as well prepare for a Democratic victory. I am for Taft. I make this statement advisedly. My opinion is based on information coming from the people with whom I come in contact and they are representative of all classes. In my opinion it is a serious mistake to think of any other candidate than Taft for the 1912 presidential nomination. The position assumed by Chairman Lee in his Washington interview can lead to but one conclusion, and that is he has in mind a dark horse for the Republican convention of next June. Whether it is Roosevelt or Beveridge I, of course, cannot say, but the chances are that Lee will be found in the support of our former senator as the convention date draws near."

and 27. On January 29 precinct committeemen of each county were to elect county chairmen. The district convention was scheduled for January 31 and the date for the meeting of the new state committee to select a new state chairman, for February 2. The district delegates were to be apportioned on the basis of one for each two hundred votes cast for the Republican candidate for secretary of state in 1910.¹⁴

The men who hoped to defeat President Taft saw their only chance in preventing instructions to delegates at various conventions. There were contests in the Third, Eighth, Ninth, Twelfth and Thirteenth districts when it came to selecting district chairmen. However most of these were friendly, the conventions adjourning without serious ruptures. In the Third district Robert W. Morris was elected over Dr. B. F. Stalker of Borden, credited with being an original Lee man. George Lilly of Anderson won out against Joseph G.

¹⁴ Indianapolis *Star and News*, January 3. The following call was agreed upon by the state committee: "To the Republicans of Indiana and to all those who desire to co-operate with them—Pursuant to the order of the Republican state committee you are invited to participate in elections in the respective counties of the state for the selection of precinct committeemen, such precinct committeemen to elect county chairmen and other officers of the county committees of the respective counties on the dates hereinafter named for the election of delegates to the district conventions for the purpose of electing district chairmen for the respective congressional districts of the state on the dates hereinafter named. The election of precinct committeemen in the respective counties and the election of delegates to district conventions for the purpose of electing district chairmen for the respective congressional districts shall be held on January 26 and 27, 1912. Precinct committeemen thus elected will meet on Monday, January 29, at such hour and place as the county committees of the respective counties shall indicate for the purpose of electing county chairmen. Delegates to district conventions will meet on Wednesday, January 31, at such hour and place in the respective congressional districts as the district chairmen shall indicate for the purpose of electing district chairmen. The district chairmen thus elected will meet in Indianapolis on Friday, February 2, at the Republican committee headquarters for the purpose of electing a chairman of the Republican state committee. Delegates to district conventions will be apportioned among the several counties of the state on the basis of one delegate for every two hundred votes and for each additional fraction of more than one hundred votes cast for Otis E. Gulley, secretary of state, at the November election, 1910. The election of precinct committeemen and delegates to district conventions as indicated above in each county of the state shall be either by primaries or mass conventions and shall be held in the respective counties, townships, precincts or wards between such hours and at such places and under such rules and regulations, not contrary to the rules of the state committee, as the county chairman may fix. The county chairmen of the several counties will apportion to the different townships, wards or precincts of their counties the representation to which they are entitled and make all necessary arrangements accordingly, giving notice at least two weeks by publication in the Republican press of their counties of the date, hour and place of voting."

Leffler of Muncie and Morton Hawkins of Portland in the Eighth district. W. O. Thomas of Monticello was elected over Warren D. Simpson of Benton county as the Tenth district chairman. The contest in the Twelfth district was probably the most spectacular of all, Allen J. Vesey of Fort Wayne being the successful candidate against Louis N. Litman of La Grange. Linus Meredith was chosen without opposition in the Sixth district. The resolution of the Seventh district meetings praised Taft but didn't suggest his renomination. This was also true in the meetings of the Fifth, Sixth, Second, First, Eighth, Eleventh and Twelfth districts. The Tenth, Third and Ninth districts endorsed Taft for renomination and criticised the extravagance of the Democratic administration in Indiana. Roosevelt sentiment went so far as to reach a caucus endorsement for him in the Eighth district; to put a soft pedal on Taft indorsement in the Eleventh, and to oppose Taft indorsement in the Twelfth as being too emphatic on the President's side. The delegation from Delaware county to the Eighth district convention was the most radical of all on the county local option question. It was accused of placing the liquor issue before party success. In the convention a resolution was carried asking for an indorsement of county option in the state platform. This was also done in the Ninth and Eleventh districts.¹⁵

On February 2 the district chairmen met in Indianapolis to elect a state chairman. There was a great deal of opposition to Mr. Lee's re-election. Some said it was wrong for a state chairman to express preferences and that Lee had made a great break because it was by the President's record that the party would stand or fall. Mr. Fred A. Simms of Frankfort had been mentioned for the party chairman in Indiana and he was elected. Will H. Hays of Sullivan was elected vice-chairman. The committee declared it would not

¹⁵ *Indianapolis News and Star*, Feb. 1, 1912. "These men constituted the new Republican state committee: Marcus S. Sonntag, Evansville; Will H. Hays, Sullivan; Robert W. Morris, New Albany; John M. Lewis, Seymour; John G. Bryson, Brazil; Linus Meredith, Richmond; John C. Ruckelshaus, Indianapolis; George Lilly, Anderson; Chas. J. Wheeler, Noblesville; W. O. Thomas, Monticello; Walter C. Baily, Peru; Allen J. Vesey, Fort Wayne; Fred Woodward, South Bend; Fred A. Simms, Frankfort, Chairman."

be a dictator of nominees in the state convention but would adhere to the tradition of refraining from indorsing any candidate for president. It was thought that the majority of the members however favored Taft.

Realizing that the whole country was seething with Progressive sentiment, the Democratic party was inclined to heed the advice of Bryan that Progressive candidates should be nominated. The Ohio Progressive Democratic League, January 2, declared that there must be no backward step in platform or candidates, and no agents of big business for delegates; that candidates should be judged by their past records as proof of their Progressive attitudes; that Parker's defeat in 1904 showed the fate of a reactionary candidate.¹⁶ By their inertia the Indiana Democrats had allowed Thomas Taggart to dominate the party. Many Progressive Democrats opposed his leadership and pointed to the disastrous defeat of 1904 in substantiation of their claims. Moreover with a division among the Republicans over local option the party was able to obtain a bare majority of twelve thousand in 1910. With even the stars in their courses fighting for the Democrats, so to speak, their majority was not very great. Friends of John W. Boehne, representative from the First district, started to boom him for governor early in the year. He would be a candidate of the people as against the machine. On March 16 he withdrew and the state convention, passing over such candidates as John A. M. Adair, Representative Ralph W. Moss, and Lieutenant Governor Frank J. Hall selected Samuel M. Ralston of Lebanon to head the ticket.

The Republican party was officially pro-Taft. To the leaders it seemed difficult if not impossible to refuse Taft an indorsement without discrediting the whole party and its policies. That the Progressive element was something to be reckoned with no one dared to deny. Charles D. Hilles, as early as January 9, declared, "the only way to make sure of shutting out Theodore Roosevelt is to bring together a convention of delegates instructed to vote for the renomination of Mr. Taft."¹⁷ The President's record it was argued had been consistent in encouraging the following legislation:

¹⁶ Indianapolis *News*, Jan. 3, 1912.

¹⁷ Indianapolis *News*, Jan. 10, 1912.

reciprocity, arbitration treaties, tariff revision, enforcement of anti-trust law, interstate commerce law, banking and currency legislation, economical methods of administration, development of the public domain, building up a high-grade judiciary and extending civil service to the postoffice department.

The Republican editorial association, meeting in Indianapolis January 26, therefore favored the renomination of the President. Besides this it went on record as advocating a return to the county unit in local option within the state.¹⁸ The Democratic state administration was denounced in no uncertain terms. Elected on a pledge of economy and retrenchment it had been characterized by extravagance and waste. New offices and bureaus had been created while the cost of the old had increased. The institutional system was inefficient and costly, tending to get the state into debt which would have to be met by higher taxes and bonds.

Secretary Nagel, of the Department of Commerce and Labor, was invited to speak in Indianapolis in defense of the administration. He accepted the invitation and made his speech in the evening of March 11. His conclusion was that the future historian would find difficulty in accounting for the war waged against Taft by some Republicans. The platform of 1908, he said, contained many specific pledges and few presidents had shown such an earnest determination to carry out their party's pledges. According to the cabinet member Taft was not criticized so much for recreancy to the platform, the last authoritative declaration of party faith, as for refusal to embrace new doctrines which had never been accepted by the party at all and which were not at that time articles in the Republican creed. The principles of the initiative, referendum and recall, according to Secretary Nagel's views were advocated by men ambitious for national office and generally avoided by those having to do with local affairs. Each was therefore making promises to which he could not be successfully held.¹⁹

¹⁸ *Indianapolis News*, Jan. 27, 1912. "Officers of the association elected at this meeting were Leo K. Fesler, of Indianapolis, president; A. A. Hargrave, of Rockville, first vice-president; J. W. Lewis, of Salem, second vice-president; B. R. Inman, of Middletown, secretary; Edgar Baldwin, of Fairmount, treasurer."

¹⁹ *Indianapolis News*, March 12, 1912.

This was a time of great stirring and ferment throughout the land. The people were groping, seeking for a new and better condition of things. After having secured new grants of control over their government they were now asking for still more. The era of democracy and the "average man" seemed to be at hand.²⁰ Economic conditions only intensified the unrest. The high cost of living was a problem being grappled with perhaps as much in Indiana as in any other state. Reform legislation, "Progressiveness" generally, was quite the thing in the campaign. It was the popular method of the hour to capture public fancy. This was more noticeable in the west where the insurgent members of congress had found themselves lined up against the members from the east over the Payne-Aldrich tariff; where Progressive legislation had already been enacted and where the spirit of the movement was demonstrated in Arizona's replacing in its constitution a judiciary recall provision which had been forced out in order to obtain admission as a state.

Perry S. Heath of Muncie, Indiana, made a tour through the western states as far as the coast. His political observations as a Republican are interesting as showing the general frame of mind in this section.

The Republican party as an organization is in peril. Those in charge have been giving attention only to the insurgents. They have overlooked the conservatives, the old liner who stood for gold and a protective tariff. Business is not good beyond the Mississippi river. There is little demand for money, loans are mostly renewals and factories are not running over time. Credits are good because collections are close and sales or purchases made cautiously. What is the matter? There is lack of confidence in the future, too much agitation, threat and uncertainty as to the interpretation of the law. One feature not reckoned with is that the fight for the Chicago nomination is breeding trouble for us in November. The Republicans are restless from fear that that party may not win in the election. The situation is similar to that of 1884 and that of 1892. If we can shift the situation from a question of trusting men to party policies, and get our forces together we can win. Our internecine trouble will hurt us at the polls. If the Democrats indorse the recall and tariff for revenue only the Republicans can pull together on these issues. I found only one place favoring the recall and none for revenue only tariff. The insurgents are now more hopeful than the old line Republican.²¹

²⁰ Indianapolis News, Jan. 1, 1912.

²¹ Indianapolis News, Feb. 1, 1912.

In Indiana the situation was almost without parallel as far as the Republicans were concerned. One could hardly have placed a finger on the average worker and declared positively where he stood. Lines were crossed as never before. Men who stood with the old organization were coming out for Roosevelt or La Follette. On the other hand men who had been followers of former Senator Beveridge were lining up behind Taft. A third term issue, the initiative, referendum and recall, no doubt, alienated a number of Roosevelt admirers. As for the Democrats the hope of victory would hold them together and they would endeavor to foster the breach in the Republican ranks.

The Socialists felt that by refusing to support the Progressives they could add to their own strength. Their objection to the ideas of the Roosevelt following was that they tended toward a sort of state socialism not in harmony with the principles of the Socialist party. The Prohibitionists were too much interested in accomplishing their purpose through their own party to endeavor to attain it through another. On the whole it appeared that the Progressive Republicans in Indiana would labor to gain control of the party organization within the state. Having done this they would appeal for support to independent voters from all other parties, some former Socialists, some Democrats, some Prohibitionists. Just how successful they would be no one could predict.

President Taft, Senator La Follette and former President Roosevelt each endeavored, either directly or indirectly, to obtain support for his candidate. The Wisconsin senator had visited Ohio, Michigan and Illinois during the closing weeks of 1911. He avoided Indiana no doubt with the idea that his ideas should have a little time to soak into her tough and conservative political system. He opened his 1912 campaign with a speech in Orchestra Hall, Chicago, January 3. The next day marked the beginning of a trolley car tour of Illinois with eighteen speeches scheduled. Throughout he figured as a safe and sane Progressive candidate.²² Janu-

²² Indianapolis *News*, Jan. 4, 1912. "The condition of non-representation—selling out—is one which has builded up within the Republican party this division we find, the Progressive Republicans and the conservative or standpat Republicans. Changes have come that make it necessary to modify past Republican principles." From La Follette's Chicago address, Jan. 3.

uary 6 in the afternoon the senator was scheduled for a speech at the Knights of Columbus hall in Terre Haute after which his party would proceed at three o'clock for meetings at Indianapolis and Richmond. The money for hall rent was contributed at the meetings. The same plan for meeting expenses was to be used at Richmond, financial aid from all those in "sympathy with the Progressive movement" was requested. At the latter place John H. Reed, chairman of the committee of factory employees, was selected to have charge of the meeting which unfortunately could not be held owing to the late arrival of Mr. La Follette. At Terre Haute he was given a flattering reception, where the Aldrich tariff and trust question received their share of attention in his speech. Changed conditions from those of the days of the Sherman act were pointed out. The trusts had increased almost to the limit "during a strenuous administration." The evils of railroad combines were slated for exposure at Richmond had an address been given there. The people had begun to think and talk politics.

As evidence of Progressive activity in Indiana at this date one notes the formation of a Hoosier Progressive League in Richmond as a branch of the state organization. While the crowd waited on La Follette cards were handed out to be signed and returned by all those in sympathy with the movement.

The progressive movement is a compact with the object of securing progressive legislation including the initiative and referendum for the determination of public questions. I, the undersigned, hereby enroll myself as a member of the Hoosier State Progressive League. I agree to support in caucus and convention candidates pledged to progressive legislation and to do my utmost to see that such candidates are brought out for nomination. The Hoosier State Progressive League is not a party movement, and my loyalty is not impaired by reason of my membership therein.

Signed _____²³

Roosevelt was more popular than La Follette in Indiana. This was proven by various straw votes taken throughout the state. In the colleges Roosevelt and Wilson were invariably chosen heads of the Republican and Democratic tickets.

²³ Membership card as given in the Indianapolis News, Jan. 2, 1912.

Taft and La Follette were on about equal standing for second place. Roosevelt clubs were formed throughout the state to promote his candidacy. Some men hesitated to favor him because of the third term argument, still others because he came out so plainly in favor of the referendum and recall before the Ohio state constitutional convention on February 1.

Immediately after this event his candidacy received another impetus when Senator La Follette was reported to be in ill health so that he would probably withdraw from the race. Men in politics for pass time, diversion and political preferment favored Taft. Traveling men, literary men, physicians, students and social workers as a rule favored the Colonel. The standpat element maintained that the Republican party would be wrecked if Roosevelt continued as a candidate. To these men his advocacy of preferential primaries at a comparatively late date would be a good excuse for his retirement in case his will in this matter suffered defeat.

President Taft stated the position of most of his sympathizers in Indiana when he made a brief address at Richmond while waiting at the railway station there on May 20. He had been "forced into the campaign." The issue of "killing the bosses" had no place in the contest for he was "as much against the bosses as their distinguished fellow townsman, William D. Foulke." In 1908 Roosevelt had commended him to the people in terms of glowing eulogy, but after four years the ex-president would return to office as "the only fit man for the job."²⁴

There were several leading Taft men throughout the state who worked for his renomination. Among these were former senator, James A. Hemenway, former representatives, James A. Watson, and Edgar D. Crumpacker, Harry S. New, Addison C. Harris, Charles A. Bookwalter, John B. Cockrum, Winfield Miller, H. C. Atkins, Clarence A. Kenyon, former vice-president, Charles W. Fairbanks, and Merrill Moores a classmate of Mr. Taft. With the Lincoln League in operation and with a number of Taft clubs throughout the state there was a well organized effort on the part of the

²⁴ Indianapolis *News*, May 20, 1912.

administration forces to retain the existing party organization.

The Progressive agitation in Indiana with its first visible symptoms in Chairman Lee's announcement at Washington soon spread throughout the state. Nat C. Wright, editor of the *Cleveland Ledger* and *Toledo Blade*, had visited Mr. Lee in Indianapolis, previous to the latter's announcement for the purpose of urging the Indiana state chairman to say that the President could not carry that state for re-election. This was the standpat version of Mr. Lee's action, in an effort to discredit the Progressive movement by showing corrupt co-operation between its leaders and the various trusts.²⁵ The claim of the Indiana chairman was doubtless made with good intentions and for the good of the party. Progressive sentiment began to manifest itself first of all in the border counties of the state. Among these Wayne, Vanderburg, Vigo, Jay, Floyd, Saint Joseph, Knox, and Allen counties were the most prominent. Interior centers of activity were in Delaware, Decatur, Cass, Hamilton, Huntington, Bartholomew, Lawrence, Monroe, Marion, Madison and Shelby counties. In each of these counties local organizations were built up looking forward to the control of the party organization, the selection of various delegates and the naming of candidates. The plan of the national Progressive workers was to have a complete party organization. Former Republican State Chairman Lee was made state chairman while Charles H. Campbell of Shelbyville was selected to represent Indiana on the national committee. The Campbell-Lee organization was thus opposed to the regular Harry S. New-Fred Simms machine.

Early in March former Senator Beveridge made it plain that he was a Progressive and was for Roosevelt. According to the standpatters about ninety per cent of the federal office holders were Beveridge appointees having been named while he was senator. Some of these men were active in the campaign while some were not. Mr. Henry W. Bennett of Indianapolis assumed leadership of the postmasters. John F. Johnston of Logansport and Francis I. Stultz of Huntington, openly and industriously worked for Roosevelt. It was easy

²⁵ Indianapolis *News*, Jan. 15, 1912.

for the old liners to accuse the Roosevelt men of offering political appointments or nominations for offices to certain Republicans whom they desired to have affiliate with them. F. S. Buggie of Shelbyville acted as secretary of the Campbell headquarters in Indianapolis (Rooms 430-432 Claypool Hotel Building). The work done here was under the direction of the Roosevelt headquarters in Chicago. Reports were sent from Indianapolis to the Chicago offices from whence they were forwarded to Senator Dixon at Washington, who had charge of the Roosevelt campaign. Mr. Beveridge became active as a Roosevelt leader and made his first important speech of the year on March 13 in Tomlinson hall, Indianapolis. Later he spoke in Illinois, Kansas and Minnesota. On April 8, accompanied by Charles H. Campbell, he went to Danville, Illinois, in order to meet Colonel Roosevelt and accompany him across northern Indiana. At Lafayette "the third term" candidate spoke on the "square deal" and important issues of the day. At Logansport a brief speech was made and at Wabash, where he declared that "if the same kind of primaries had been held in Indiana as will be held in Illinois tomorrow the people instead of the politicians would have ruled." While in Peru he took occasion to thank the Eleventh district for its victory at the delegate convention which had been held March 28 at Wabash. Before leaving Huntington his final declaration was that the case should rest with the people. At Fort Wayne the Republicans were charged with unfair tactics in an effort to defeat his supporters:

Our opponents are apparently willing to proceed to any lengths to nullify the will of the people. When they descend to methods of that sort they forfeit all right to represent the Republican party or bind it.

The corrupt methods to which Colonel Roosevelt referred in his Fort Wayne speech of April 8 were those employed by the old Republican party organization throughout the state in order to obtain Taft delegates in the district conventions of March. Each district selected two delegates to the national Republican convention. On March 26 the state convention selected four delegates at large.

The Taft men organized the convention at Evansville al-

most at will although the anti-administration men made a lot of noise and announced several contests. There were $48\frac{3}{4}$ Taft delegates and $11\frac{1}{4}$ for Roosevelt outside of Vanderburgh county. When the members from Vanderburgh were counted there was a total of $63\frac{3}{4}$ Taft and $31\frac{1}{4}$ Roosevelt votes. Charles F. Heilman and James A. Hemenway were thus selected as Taft delegates to the national convention. The first contest arose in selecting a permanent chairman. Daniel H. Ortmeyer, a regular Republican, opposed Philip Gould, a Roosevelt man, for the place. Gould finally withdrew, while a shout for Teddy went up as Ortmeyer tried to speak. The report of the committee on rules could not be heard when read, but was adopted nevertheless.

Dickman's Hall had been hired the day before by the Roosevelt men in anticipation of a rump. They at once retired to this meeting place where Charles Finley Smith of Evansville and W. F. Adams of Spencer county were selected as delegates to the national convention. Resolutions adopted affirmed allegiance to the Republican party, its principles and candidates which might be named by an honest majority of Republican voters; Roosevelt, the logical candidate, who was needed to meet present conditions; did not indorse unfair methods used throughout the district to overthrow the will of the majority; that they represented the yeomen of the party; the attitude of the independent press was commended; Taft's administration they considered unsatisfactory and furthermore he could not be re-elected.²⁶

While the preliminary conflict was raging at Evansville the Republicans in the Seventh district were selecting delegates to their convention to be held March 16. There was no law under which a primary could be held and, as one would expect, some unfair methods were used. The vote was about 30% of the party strength so that it did not fairly represent public opinion. It showed a preference for Taft of almost three to one (Taft 8,690, Roosevelt 3,275). The convention therefore was controlled by Taft followers. The Roosevelt men had but six delegates seated while they contested fifty-five more. With all of these, however, it would

²⁶ Indianapolis *Star*, March 16, 1912.

have been impossible to elect delegates pledged to Roosevelt. The total number in the convention was 134, so that 68 would have been necessary to insure control. There was some talk of a rump, but it did not appear. In view of the November returns in Marion county it appears that there must have been serious misrepresentation of the Progressive strength in the primary and convention. The resolutions of the standpat majority confirmed the party platform of 1908 and approved the Taft administration. They favored representative government as established by the constitution of the United States, disapproved the initiative, referendum and recall. The Republican party was the "party of progress" guided by experience, statesmanship and the protection of home industry.²⁷ William E. English and Samuel Lewis Shank were chosen as delegates.

The Progressives determined that a final effort should be made to carry the remaining district mass conventions for Roosevelt. In Scott county, for example, they were well organized, making a personal mail campaign to obtain control of the convention. The results of such organization are evident from the fact that four Roosevelt delegates to both the state and Third district conventions were chosen. George W. Applegate and C. W. Crim were named in the Third district; O. H. Montgomery and Webb Woodfil in the Fourth; William R. McKeen and S. A. Hayes in the Fifth. The factions were of about equal strength in the Sixth and Eighth districts. In the former the Maxwell-Briscoe Motor Company of New Castle sent a train load of its employees to the Connersville gathering, where two Taft delegates, Enos Porter and T. C. Bryson, were elected for the Chicago convention. State convention delegates W. H. Elliott and Edward Hill were both Taft men. The President's forces had a good majority in the Second and Tenth districts. The Eighth went to Roosevelt with Harold Hobbs and Edward C. Toner as delegates. The Ninth was also lost by Taft by a vote of 70 4/10 to 54 6/10, William H. Dye and William Endicott being selected as national delegates.

The Thirteenth district convention was held at Warsaw

²⁷ *Indianapolis News*, March 16, 1912.

April 2. The convention followers crowded the city. A noteworthy feature was the exciting and noisy contest which characterized the session. The Taft men controlled by only $\frac{1}{2}$ vote, naming as delegates Clem Studebaker Jr. of South Bend and Morris Fox of LaPorte. Without delay the Roosevelt men held a hasty rump, naming Fred W. Keller of Warsaw and P. R. Judkins of Elkhart as delegates.

In the Twelfth district the Taft men made little opposition to the selection of two Roosevelt delegates, Harry Brown of Waterloo and H. H. Rerick. The convention instructed the delegates for Roosevelt and endorsed Chas. H. Campbell for national committeeman.

There were a total of 1,439 delegates for the state convention selected in the various districts by primary elections or by conventions. Of the total number Taft men claimed 823. The Roosevelt men claimed 606, leaving ten contested. However, there was the Monroe county delegation claimed by Taft men, but contested by their opponents. There were thirteen of these delegates and they are included in the Taft total.²⁸

District.	For Taft.	For Roosevelt.	Contested
1.	54	37	6-a
2.	81	25	13-b
3.	50	42	0
4.	60 $\frac{29}{42}$	44 $\frac{13}{42}$	1-c
5.	65	31	0
6.	54 $\frac{1}{2}$	51 $\frac{1}{2}$	0-d
7.	128	5	1 e
8.	52	54	0-f
9.	63	61	1-g
10.	79	42	0
11.	52 $\frac{1}{3}$	65 $\frac{2}{3}$	0 L
12.	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	75 $\frac{1}{2}$	0
13.	70	72	1-h

a. Vanderburg Co. b. Monroe Co., included in Taft's 81. One neutral from Morgan Co. not included. c. Decatur Co. d. Two sets in Henry Tp. Henry Co. where a compromise was planned. e. Outside Indianapolis. f. Madison Co. contested. g. Montgomery Co. h. One of the three Taft delegates from Elkhart Co. contested but included above.

On the eve of March the 26th, delegates from the various districts met to select members of the various committees, as well as to form an organization for the state convention. Taft men were present in sufficient numbers to enable them

²⁸ Indianapolis *Star*, April 24, 1912.

to organize the convention in spite of objections of Roosevelt followers. "Rump" meetings were held by the latter in the Third, Sixth and Eleventh districts. The Taft men were able to control the selection of approximately eight members on each of the various committees.

The credentials committee acted on some 134 contests. Of this number the Taft supporters gained 130, while the Roosevelt ranks were strengthened by one additional delegate from Posey county and from a Terre Haute ward. It was necessary for the police to assist Chairman John B. Cockrum in maintaining order. Taft members of the committee had been selected from the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Tenth districts, leaving the Eighth, Ninth, Eleventh, Twelfth and Thirteenth for the Roosevelt sympathizers. Edward Warfel of the Sixth district and A. P. Hauss of the Third were unsuccessful Roosevelt contestants for places on the committee.

The first test of the comparative strength of the two forces came on a vote to table the minority report of the Roosevelt members of the credentials committee. The vote stood 772 to table, against 667 opposed. This indicated that the Taft men had a majority of about 105 in the convention.²⁹

At a conference of the Roosevelt men in the headquarters just before the convention it was decided to propose a compromise. The substance of the plan was that two Roosevelt and two Taft delegates at large be named by the convention. Wallace B. Campbell of Anderson, Eighth district member of the resolutions committee, made the proposal. Frederick Landis of Logansport was selected to present the conference plan. During the session of the convention Horace Stilwell discussed the plan with Mr. Harry S. New, but he refused to give it any encouragement. Charles H. Campbell then tried James P. Goodrich, but he also disapproved of such action. Practically all the Roosevelt men were active in behalf of such a course, but their opponents allowed them no headway. With the regular organization men it was simply a case of taking everything since it was possible to do so.

By a vote of 776 to 667 the convention named Charles

²⁹ *Indianapolis News*, March 26, 1912.

W. Fairbanks, Harry S. New, Joseph D. Olliver and James E. Watson as delegates at large to the national convention. No "anti" names were presented by the Progressives. A "rump" held by them after the regular convention selected Albert J. Beveridge, Edwin M. Lee, Charles H. Campbell, Frederick Landis for delegates at large. The alternates were Joseph H. Campbell, G. E. Jeffries, Mort Hawkins and Charles J. Adams. For electors, Fred W. Keller, South Bend, and Warren Sayre of Wabash were named with C. O. Roemler of Indianapolis and W. O. Bohannon of Evansville as contingent electors.

The platform was adopted by the resolutions committee by a vote of 7 to 6. Jesse L. Dunning, an ex-soldier and Roosevelt man, offered a resolution to indorse the Sherwood pension bill, already passed by the house of representatives, with a petition to the Senate and President that they respectively pass and sign it. He also proposed to strike out the endorsement of President Taft. Both of these proposals were lost by a 7 to 6 vote. Wallace B. Campbell suggested that the declaration against the initiative, referendum and recall be omitted, but this was not done. The delegates at large were instructed to vote for Taft. On the tariff question the resolutions were orthodox, but it was so subordinated that even a free trader could not object to the wording. This was accomplished by the assertion that "the Republican party has established and maintained protection." Taft's administrative achievements were summarized and commended, while the third term idea of the former president was opposed as something which "Washington, Jefferson or Jackson could not have and which Grant could not get."³⁰

Attention was now directed to the national convention of the party. All contests would be finally decided there and the true strength and character of the Progressive movement manifest itself. On May 13 all the Indiana delegates were to meet at the Claypool hotel at Indianapolis in response to a call sent out by Harry S. New and Fred A. Simms. Accordingly Charles A. Campbell issued a similar call for the ten uncontested Roosevelt delegates and the twelve elected

³⁰ Indianapolis News, March 27, 1912.

by the "rump" to meet at the same place: The Simms-New meeting was for the purpose of arranging hotel accommodations and headquarters in Chicago, while the Campbell meeting framed up contest plans. On May 14 Ormsby McHarg, who had charge of the contests in the 1908 convention, conferred with Mr. Campbell in Indianapolis. It was agreed that the contests should be drawn up in approved form and presented before the national committee by Horace Stilwell of Anderson.

Long before the convention date State Chairman Simms announced that he was swamped with requests for tickets. This showed a great interest in Indiana, for as a rule the state has been rather tardy in stirring up enthusiasm of this kind, but once started it eclipsed almost any of our commonwealths. As one Republican put it, the "Hoosiers love a good scrap." Many Roosevelt men, enthusiastic over their leader and angered because of machine domination, were eager to journey to the Windy City for a final encounter with the foe. They would oppose Senator Root for the temporary chairmanship offering Governor Hadley of Missouri instead. When their leader arrived it was planned to make a great demonstration.

On June 10 and 11 the national committee took up the consideration of the Indiana contests. Indianapolis was the crux of the case. Practically all of Marion county's 134 delegates to the state convention had been Taft men. If there was fraud anywhere in Indiana it must have been in Indianapolis. When George L. Record of New Jersey spoke on the Governor Hadley motion to substitute the Roosevelt temporary roll for the roll prepared by the national committee it almost caused a fight between some of the Indiana delegates. He stated that the Seventh Indiana district returns were made up by election officials without even opening the ballot box. William E. English, one of the Seventh district delegates, sprang to his feet and declared that there was no contest there. William H. Dye of Noblesville, a Roosevelt delegate, questioned English's statement, whereupon, according to the newspaper reports, the latter yelled back "liar, liar, liar".³¹ The national committee had by a vote of 52 to

³¹ *Indianapolis News*, June 19, 1912.

0 seated all the Taft delegates at large from this state as well as those contested from the First, Third, Fourth and Thirteenth districts.

The credentials committee meeting on the evening of June 20 seated the four Indiana delegates at large by a vote of 34 to 11. The two Taft delegates from the Thirteenth district were also seated. Merrill Moores of Indianapolis had charge of preparing and presenting the Taft contests from Indiana.

James A. Hemenway was Indiana's member of the credentials committee.

Elihu Root received 558 votes to 502 for McGovern of Wisconsin in the race for the temporary chairmanship. Indiana's vote was strictly factional being twenty for Root and ten for McGovern. On a motion that no delegates whose seats had been contested should vote in the matter of selecting members of the credentials committee and that no such delegate should vote in the settlement of any of the contests James E. Watson, Taft's floor leader, moved to table it referring the question to the credentials committee. This brought out the second test vote of the convention showing a gain for the Taft men, the figuring being 564 to 510.

The vote for President stood Taft 561, La Follette 41, Roosevelt 197, Cummins 17, Hughes 2, not voting 344, absent 6. On this contest seven of the Roosevelt delegates from Indiana obeyed the orders of their chief and remained silent while Porter, Bryson, and Toner voted for the Oyster Bay man. The vote for vice-president was Sherman 597; Hadley 14; Borah 21; Merriam 20; Beveridge 1; Howard F. Gillette of Illinois 2; not voting 352; absent 71. Porter cast his vote for Sherman while Bryson and Toner supported Hadley.

The platform adopted by the convention was marked by several innovations. It dealt with issues in a general way yet more concisely than usual. No direct reference was to be found in it to any pending legislation at least by name. The party still believed in a protective tariff but admitted that some schedules were too high recommending a tariff board to make adjustments. In censuring the Democratic tariff bills of the last congressional session and denying that the protective tariff was responsible for high prices two

blunders were made according to the opinion of many. It was admitted that a simplification of existing methods of removing derelict judges would be helpful when such a course became necessary. The recall was considered unwise, for the integrity of the courts might be impaired by its operation. Other recommendations included the continuance of Taft's peace treaties; supplementary legislation for the Sherman anti-trust law; steps toward farm loans and financial readjustment; the merit system; campaign publicity; parcel post; adequate navy and marine; flood prevention; reclamation; river and harbor work; the leasing system for Alaska; safety at sea; immigration legislation; continuation of the previous policy toward Porto Rico and the Philippines.

When it became evident that his contesting delegates would not be seated Colonel Roosevelt refused to recognize the further procedure of the convention as binding. Much talk emanated from the Coliseum as to the likelihood of a third party being formed. A conference of Progressive leaders on the night of June 20 resulted in the final decision as to their future course with a statement from the third term himself:

If the honestly elected majority of the convention chooses to proceed with business and to nominate me as the candidate of the real Republican party I shall accept. If some of them fear to take such a stand and the remainder chooses to inaugurate a movement to nominate me for the presidency as a Progressive on a Progressive platform, and if in such event the general feeling among Progressives favors my being nominated, I shall accept.

The meaning of this announcement was clear. It meant a bolt that would not seem like a bolt. While the Republican party platform might appear to be very progressive—as it did—yet the party could not be trusted to carry out the pledges made therein so that a new party resulted. A sharp difference of opinion developed among Roosevelt supporters. On one side a group of radicals headed by Governor Johnson of California, George L. Record of New Jersey, Gifford and Amos Pinchot of Pennsylvania and Washington respectively, James R. Garfield of Ohio and ex-Senator Beveridge of Indiana were for taking such action as would of necessity start a new party. Opposed to these were men like Senator

Borah of Idaho, Governor Hadley of Missouri, and Victor Murdock of Kansas, who refused to desert the regular party.

A majority of the Roosevelt delegates were willing and indeed eager to follow him in a new venture. By forming a temporary organization, at a mass meeting, the delegates were held together until more definite steps could be taken. Work toward the formation of a Progressive party, as it was to be known, started immediately throughout the country.

ORGANIZING THE NEW PARTY

Following pre-arranged plans, a majority of the Roosevelt delegates to the national convention following an informal and unofficial nomination of Mr. Roosevelt for the presidency, gathered at Orchestra hall on the night of June 22, where they formulated agreements for their future course. The new party determined to hold state conventions for nominating electoral, state and legislative tickets where there seemed any chance of success. At a conference between Roosevelt and Governor Johnson of California, Sunday June 23, it was agreed that the latter should appoint a committee of seven which, with the former's advice, should do the preliminary work of organizing a new party and issue the call for a national convention to be held early in August at Denver or Chicago.

No prominent Indiana political leader appeared on the stage, or went on record as taking an active part in the "rump" meeting at Chicago. Seven out of the ten Roosevelt delegates to the G. O. P. convention were reported as attending. The list included William Holton Dye of Noblesville (9th District); Dave Harris of Marion (11th District); J. P. Kenower of Huntington (12th District); Horace Hobbs of Muncie (8th District); William Endicott of Crawfordsville (9th District); and Harry Brown of Waterloo (13th District). These men received the instructions to return home and ascertain the popular sentiment. If the people back home balked it was understood there should be no third party.

Edwin M. Lee called a conference of Progressives to meet in Indianapolis on July 3. In a telegram to Theodore Roosevelt he had asked advice as to the advisability of launching

a third party in Indiana.¹ To the telegram Roosevelt replied:

I heartily approve the project. Go on with the commission of the Progressive party. Such a party must of necessity break away from both of the old organizations.

Considerable difference of opinion prevailed among the men before the conference opened. All were not willing to go as far as Mr. Lee who believed that a third party should be organized immediately. However, it appeared as if Mr. Lee would make a strong effort to effect a temporary state organization.

Just before the conference met in the Claypool Hotel a number of the men frankly admitted that they were "up in the air" and were undecided just what to do. Those who came from other counties showed a disposition to investigate the Indiana situation from all angles. R. R. Rerick and Louis Litman of Lagrange called at Republican State Headquarters to talk things over with State Chairman Fred A. Sims. Some of the more enthusiastic members, who especially desired to punish the Republican machine for its sins, were Rudolph G. Leeds and Ed Harris of Richmond, Russell K. Bedgood of Bedford, J. M. Horten and Fletcher Paine of Wabash, Paul L. Haworth of West Newton and Lon Hodson of New Castle.

More conservative views were held by William D. Headrick and Charles O. Roemler of Indianapolis. They were inclined to stay with the Republican party making an effort to obtain a good Republican state ticket and adopt a good Progressive platform. In other words those who were inclined to be regular politically sought to cleanse the old party from within, failing in which it would then be time to get out.

The "Big Chief" was out already. His telegram urging the "necessity" of a break from both the old parties practically assured a formal schism in Republican ranks. Some

¹"Subject to your approval by wire I will recommend to the conference of Indiana Progressive Republicans here Wednesday P. M., July 3, that we proceed with the third party organization. The result at Baltimore may affect its immediate effectiveness but does not ignore the necessity for it. Indiana Progressive Republicans are not Democrats and cannot obtain full expression of their sentiments through Democratic channels, though progressive. Kindly give us the benefit of your ideas." *Indianapolis News*, July 3, 1912.

had already taken the plunge while others wavered. Most speakers asserted their belief in the principles of the Republican party but usually advanced the theory that Roosevelt was the "real" nominee and President Taft the "bolter" on account of the alleged fraudulent votes cast for him at Chicago.

Mr. Lee read a long letter from Horace C. Stilwell of Anderson explaining why a new political movement was necessary. Comment on the letter led some to say that Stilwell was being groomed for governor. Others mentioned were Albert J. Beveridge and Frederick Landis. Beveridge was in Maine at the time so that no one knew just where he stood. A motion for the "Bull Moose" party to put a full state ticket in the field carried. Moreover, owing to the short time, a state committee could not be selected by primaries but according to the old party methods.

The following men were chosen as district committeemen of the new party and drew up the resolutions. First district, Charles Finley Smith; Second, Joseph E. Henley; Third, R. B. Stevenson; Fourth, Dr. Carl Payne; Fifth, Solon Enloe; Sixth, E. F. Warfel; Seventh, Harry Chamberlin; Eighth, Clayte Sells; Ninth, William Holton Dye; Tenth G. K. Stimson; Eleventh, S. E. McConnell; Twelfth, R. H. Rerick, and Thirteenth, L. N. Litman of Lagrange (as no one from that district was there). The following statement was issued:

Whereas, This conference considers the action of the Republican National Committee as unworthy, fraudulent and not representative of the rank and file of the party; and

Whereas, We regard the liberties of the people jeopardized by the "vicious circle" dominated and controlled by the political bosses and agents of special privilege and corruption; be it therefore

Resolved, That we (representing the Progressive members of the party in Indiana) do hereby denounce such action as unfair and destructive and in so far as we recognize the same predatory influences dictating the machinery of each of the old parties, we further declare ourselves determined not to abide by the results of such practice and we hereby pledge our readiness to co-operate in an effort to restore to the people their rights to govern themselves; and further

Resolve, That we pledge the people of Indiana that the state ballot shall contain the electoral ticket permitting Progressive Republicans and all others who will stand with them to vote for a presidential candidate representative of their principles; further

Resolved, That a state convention shall be called as soon as possible to continue the work of this conference.²

J. V. Zartman of Indianapolis started a little demonstration by proposing that the name "Republican" be stricken from the phrase "Progressive Republicans" used in the resolutions. He said a Democrat who wished to join in the movement had expressed the wish at the beginning of the meeting that the designation of "Progressive Republican" had not been used but that the men in the new movement should style themselves simply "progressives". Several men supported the suggestion but Joseph E. Henley of Bloomington protesting against such a step said, "We met here as Republicans and we came as Republicans of the Progressive type. I do not think the word 'Republican' should be stricken out. The reading of the resolution doesn't bar out any other progressive voter who wishes to join us". No change was made in the name.

To complete the temporary organization E. M. Lee was named as state chairman and Harvey B. Stout, Jr., of Indianapolis, secretary. Authority was given the chairman to appoint an executive committee composed of a representative from each of the thirteen congressional districts.

Senator Joseph M. Dixon as chairman of the Committee of Seven, named to have charge of the preliminary organization of the new party, sounded a call for its first national convention. The date set was for August 5, and the place selected Chicago. The conference of Indiana Progressives had made a bid for the convention to come to Indianapolis, but Chicago had already been chosen. The Committee of Seven and prominent Roosevelt leaders in forty states signed the call. For Indiana, Edwin M. Lee and Horace C. Stilwell affixed their signatures. Each state was to select delegates by its own method. The representation was cut down to one-half of the regular numbers. This was considered advisable because the convention would be largely a deliberative body and composed of a class of men altogether different from those who usually attended conventions.

Close upon the call for a national convention Chairman

² Indianapolis *News and Star*, July 4, 1912.

Lee arranged for a meeting of the state executive committee authorized by the third party conference of July 3. At this meeting, July 12, further details of the state organization were planned. Two problems of more than ordinary importance came up for discussion. One of these, that of putting independent tickets in the field where some Roosevelt men were already nominees of the Republican party brought out some earnest discussion. The argument against such a course was that the chances of both parties would be ruined.

The second question was whether the state convention, if one was called, should be held before or after the Republican state convention dated for August 6. The prevailing sentiment favored an earlier date, holding that if the third party waited until after the Republican convention, the latter would adopt as radical a platform and nominate as radical a Progressive ticket as it could find timber for, in order to anticipate if possible the third party platform and ticket.

The committee decided that Roosevelt men nominated for presidential electors by the Republicans in five of the thirteen districts should resign.³ John I. Nixon of Attica, a Roosevelt man so nominated in the Ninth district, had already resigned by sending a letter to State Chairman Sims of the Republican state committee. Cornelius McGrevey from the Eleventh district also expected to resign unless the Republican state convention put him off before he had a chance to do so. Austin W. Stults of Ft. Wayne said he would remain regular, although he had worked for Roosevelt and had been nominated as a Roosevelt elector. Fred S. Buggie of Shelbyville also expressed his desire to remain regular.

A sub-committee consisting of Horace C. Stilwell, Rudolph Leeds, William H. Dye, Harry O. Chamberlain and E. M.

³ The following men were appointed by temporary Chairman Lee to constitute the Executive Committee authorized by the conference, July 3. On July 12 it was made the permanent state committee. First district, William Adams of Rockport; Second, Joseph Campbell, of Bloomington; Third, Dr. J. B. Stalker, of Borden; Fourth, George L. Jeffries, of Franklin; Fifth, Dr. A. H. Hickman, of Terre Haute; Sixth, Rudolph G. Leeds, of Richmond; Seventh, Harry O. Chamberlin, of Indianapolis; Eighth, Clayte Sells, of Anderson; Ninth, William Holton Dye, of Noblesville; Tenth, E. R. Coffin, of Monticello; Eleventh, Cornelius McGrevey, of Wabash; Twelfth, Louis N. Littman, of Lagrange; Thirteenth, Wilson Rose, of Elkhart, and L. W. Vail, of Goshen. According to Chairman Lee two men were appointed from the Thirteenth to avoid the unlucky number.

Lee was appointed to issue the call for the state convention and have charge of all arrangements for it.* The call also included an address to the people setting forth the third party's appeal for support. Headquarters were to be opened at the English Hotel on July 15, but the location was subsequently changed to the Majestic Building before that date. August 1 was named as the date for the state convention. The committee decided to enter the field in every county, nominating congressional, judicial, legislative and county tickets all over the state. One delegate was allowed for every 500 votes cast by all parties at the last general election. According to this ratio the total number would be about 1400. A state committee should be elected by district delegates on the night before the convention. The new committee thus chosen would then elect a state chairman. Recommendations were given for the holding of congressional, county and other local conventions as well as for the nomination of tickets. At the state convention a state ticket would be nominated, a platform drawn up and two delegates-at-large selected to attend the national convention at Chicago, August 5. Considerable opposition to local tickets was manifested, so that a compromise resulted, the committee merely recommending that third party tickets be nominated along with a full set of presidential electors.

July of this year was marked by new party organization all over the state. Most of this activity was to be found in the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Eleventh, Twelfth and Thirteenth districts where the Progressives were strongest. The work consisted chiefly in perfecting county party machinery by electing chairmen, secretaries and treasurers. Speakers at these meetings regularly denounced the tactics used by the Republican party at its state and national conventions. An address made by Fred Landis at Logansport July 20 illustrates the feeling that existed.

The Indianapolis and Chicago Republican conventions were the greatest reunions of anarchists and pirates that were ever assembled in America. The state convention at Indianapolis looked more like an audience to be addressed by Emma Goldman than a convention of Hoosier citizens. The hall was packed with policemen ready to do the bidding of Taft henchmen who were in control.⁴

* *Indianapolis News*, July 22, 1912.

Other interesting features of the early stages of Progressivism which were characteristic of its entire career are typified by an Indianapolis meeting in Irvington on July 20.⁵ At this meeting men having all sorts of previous political affiliations were present. The list included seven original Taft men, thirteen Roosevelt men, five Democrats, three Prohibitionists, two Socialists and one who styled himself a Wilson Republican. Another feature was the taking of a collection to meet expenses. Each ward was expected to raise twenty-five dollars for committee expenses. According to Willitts A. Bastian, the speaker, there should be no "slush" fund. The Progressive party organization in Indiana was comparatively poor financially most of the time.

The district organizers appointed by Chairman Lee deserved more than ordinary credit for the substantial machinery which they built up within so short a time. Regular Republicans naturally accused the Democrats of "egging" the new movement along. This was true, but the Republicans received honest encouragement as well. From a Democratic viewpoint the Indiana situation presented a united Democracy, a disorganized, disgraced, warring opposition party that had utterly failed to carry out its pledges. For them it was well for the Progressive and Republicans to fight it out, and they quoted approvingly the old proverb "when rogues fall out, just men get their dues." Good Democratic politics therefore dictated the policy of giving aid and comfort to both factions in the enemy's ranks.

Printed programs sent out from the state headquarters gave instructions for the holding of county mass conventions (July 27 and 29) for the purpose of selecting delegates to the state convention, August 1. These gave the apportionment of delegates to the various counties, the locations of district meetings on the night before the convention, the order in which nominations would be made. On the front page of the program was printed "Thou shalt not steal" while on the inside appeared the slogan by the Bull Moosers, "We would rather be right than regular."

Pro-Bull-Moose reports said "enthusiasm reigned supreme" among the "crowds" attending the conventions. On the other

⁵ Indianapolis News, July 22, 1912.

hand conservative reports claimed little enthusiasm except where "manufactured" for the occasion, and that many Democrats and Republicans attended out of curiosity. Almost uniformly the gatherings indorsed Roosevelt for President and Beveridge for governor. The following resolution was passed at Boonville and is typical.

For President of the United States we stand unfalteringly for a man who has been the champion of the plain people for more than thirty years, a man who has never sacrificed the plain people that he might seek the favor of wealth and power, a man who is the embodiment of Democracy, the cowboy, the soldier, the huntsman, the scholar, the writer, the orator and statesman, a man of unusual mental, moral and physical courage, Theodore Roosevelt.⁶

At Huntington the meeting adopted as a platform Clifford Jackman's "contract with the people." The temperance plank held that the liquor traffic is a "moral" question, proposing the initiative and referendum as a permanent solution in the meantime favoring county local option.⁷ Woman suffrage, new nationalism and the elimination of bosses were common planks urged upon the state convention by several counties.

George B. Lockwood, editor of the *Marion Chronicle*, who had accused E. M. Lee and Horace Stilwell of being "Liquor-crats" allies of the Taggart-Crawford Fairbanks machine, probably stirred up the liquor question more than usual at this time. The accused men replied in the following manner:

The statement that we, or either of us, are in sympathy or accord with the Indiana liquor machine, is an unmitigated falsehood, and the person who makes such a statement is guilty of a deliberate and intentional misrepresentation. It is not our purpose to notice every mongrel that may bark, and we only notice this one long enough to say that had we been less citizens and more political hacks we should be found now with Lockwood priding ourselves upon our loyalty to the old party and our disloyalty to our country; boasting of our "regularity" in the face of our party's irregularities; approving theft, dishonesty and fraud and condemning virtue, citizenship and patriotism.

There can be but little doubt but that the question of local third party tickets was the most difficult one which the county conventions had to solve. Those who opposed them claimed

⁶ *Indianapolis News*, July 29, 1912.

⁷ *Indianapolis News*, July 30, 1912.

they would destroy the third party movement in many counties. This, it was argued, would be especially true where Republicans had already nominated their county tickets and where the candidates had already been working on their fences. It seemed unjust to vote against a Progressive candidate nominated by the Republicans simply because he happened to be selected before the time of the new party.

Those advocating the local tickets advanced the theory that the local third partyites could hold over the heads of candidates already nominated the threat of a third ticket in order to force them to agree to support the Bull Moose electoral vote. The fact that some Republican nominees resented this intimidation and that the third party muddle would open the way for effective work by the Democrats added to the unpleasantness of the situation.

In Vanderburg county the Bull Moosers divided into three factions over the local ticket question. One headed by Charles T. Smith who, it was said, didn't want anything injurious done to the Democrats, was not strong for either a state, congressional or county ticket; another headed by Samuel Crumbaker, former state senator, anxious to have a state ticket nominated, did not care about a congressional ticket but opposed a county ticket; while the third group, led by Robert Gore, demanded all kinds of tickets. According to Republican interpretation these three leaders picked their share of the thirty-seven delegates chosen by the county convention for the state gathering, August 8.⁸ However true or false the report, it showed a difference of opinion among Progressives as to the effect third tickets would have upon the success of their cause. The election returns seemed to indicate that Indiana voters, like those from the other states, considered the Progressive issues more national than state or local.

Delegates met by districts on the night of July 31 to elect district members of the various committees, officers of the state convention, district chairmen and candidates for electors. The meetings were but fairly well attended because there were no contests to speak of. The credentials committee which met after the district meetings adjourned having no business before it.

⁸ Indianapolis News, July 30, 1912.

First district: W. F. Adams, of Rockport, was chairman; Monte M. Katterjohn, of Boonville, secretary. Samuel Crumbaker, of Evansville, obtained a coveted place on the Resolutions committee.

Second district: Sentiment was strong for "Beveridge for governor," being brought out in a speech by Judge James B. Wilson, of Bloomington. R. L. Morgan, of Bloomington, was elected permanent chairman of the meeting with George W. Lott, of Vincennes, secretary. Speeches were also made by Dr. Amos S. Hershey, of Indiana University, H. R. Louder, of Bloomfield, and Judge T. J. Terhune, of Linton.

Third district: Washington county was not represented but the room finally became filled. H. C. Poindexter, of Jeffersonville, was chairman. A feeling prevailing that the Third district ought to be represented on the state ticket, Lawson M. Mace was therefore indorsed for attorney general, and Beveridge for governor. According to reports, one speaker in likening Roosevelt to Moses, who would lead the people to victory, became so excited that he dropped his false teeth. He caught them however before they hit the floor. All the counties desired representation of some sort which accounted for the selection of three delegates to the national convention, each with a one-third vote, and three alternates.

Fourth district: Fred Morgan, from Batesville, was made chairman and O. I. Demaree, secretary. There were no contests, all places being filled by acclamation except one instance, that of presidential electors. John Overmyer, of Jennings county, was nominated as well as Captain W. Haiken, of Hope. Overmeyer then withdrew, being placed on the resolutions committee instead. Two delegates to the national convention, with a one-half vote each, were chosen and instructed for Roosevelt. Beveridge and Mace were also indorsed.

Fifth district: There was but little excitement developed in the Fifth district meeting. W. J. Snyder, of Brazil, an alternate delegate to the national convention, made a speech in which he urged the workers to "go back home and button-hole the Democrats." Richard H. Crouch, of Greencastle, later district chairman, presided with John T. Hume, of Danville, as secretary.

Sixth district: Men from the Sixth district discussed the

wet and dry issue for some time. Rudolph Leeds, of Richmond, declared he would not accept a nomination for the resolutions committee if he had to stand for a local option plank. He preferred instead the initiative and referendum issue. F. W. Hemenway, of Union county; G. R. Carter, of Fayette county, and W. R. Steele, of Henry county, well-known temperance men, said they favored the initiative and referendum. Leeds was elected to the resolution committee. William Dudley Foulke in a speech eulogized Roosevelt, but said the new party would have to look out for Wilson whom he characterized as an "honest man." Will Bond, of Richmond, was indorsed for judge of the Fourth Indiana judicial circuit.

Seventh district: Men representing the Seventh Indiana district engaged in a rather long and noisy session. Dr. R. C. Light, of Broad Ripple, acted as chairman. Harry O. Chamberlin, who had been provisional district chairman, was elected to that position permanently. The difficulty arose in electing delegates to the national convention. Lucius B. Swift, a Democrat before 1896, then a Republican until 1912, but finally a Progressive, was chosen as a delegate to the convention as planned prior to the meeting. The same thing was expected in the case of Charles S. Lewis, but since eight names were proposed the delegates voted for four allowing the others to be alternates. The delegates chosen were Swift, Henry Reminger, J. F. Wild and Dr. R. C. Light. The alternates named were Charles S. Lewis, Z. V. Zartman, G. B. Griffey and Dr. G. W. Ward (colored).

Eighth district: Clayte Sells, of Anderson, presided at the Eighth district meeting. He was afterward elected district chairman. Rev. Geo. W. Schraeder, of Winchester, received appointment as the Eighth district's representative on the resolutions committee. Resolutions, including an indorsement of Beveridge, carried.

Ninth district: One contest marked the Ninth district meeting. W. R. Hines, of Frankfort, and Fay Cullens, of Kokomo, were both candidates for the resolutions committee. Cullens was elected. By a vote of 66-43 it was decided to drop county option if the platform committee did not look on it with favor. William H. Dye was elected district chairman with Noel C. Neal, also of Noblesville, secretary, and Charles

Adams, of Kokomo, treasurer of the district committee. August 10 was selected as the date for the district convention.

Tenth district: Delegates from the Tenth district selected Dr. G. R. Coffin, of Monticello, for district chairman. After indorsing Beveridge for governor the name of B. B. Baker, of Monticello, was proposed as a candidate for state treasurer. August 14 was decided upon for the Tenth district convention at Rensselaer.

Eleventh district: John Lawrence, of Peru, acted as temporary chairman. C. E. Spalding, of Winamac, was selected as secretary. After the withdrawal of A. S. Boyer, of Logansport, and J. W. Caswell, of Huntington, William M. Hasty, of Marion, was elected to the resolutions committee.

Twelfth district: Two questions troubled the Twelfth district men. One was county local option while the other was whether Bull Moosers should attend the Republican district convention at Kendallville August 3. Some favored a Progressive candidate for congress on the Republican ticket. Others wanted a candidate of their own. Delegates from Lagrange and Noble counties were opposed to third party county tickets, saying that men already on the Republican ticket were Progressives, and that it would cause strife to ask them to resign. One delegate expressed the real stumbling block when he remarked:

We don't want a third ticket in Lagrange county, because a third ticket would mean that the Democrats would win out, and we don't want any Democrats in the courthouse. There has never been a Democrat in a county office in Lagrange county and we don't want to put any of them there now.

No final decision was arrived at on this issue, but local option followed as soon as possible by state prohibition became the verdict on that question. Louis N. Litman was chosen for district chairman.

Thirteenth district: After Captain Runyan, of Warsaw, had declined it, F. E. Lambert, of South Bend, accepted the district chairmanship at a meeting of delegates from that section. Judge John C. Richter after announcing that he would not seek the congressional nomination for that year was made a candidate for contingent elector.⁹

⁹ Indianapolis News, Aug. 1, 1912.

Members of committees, district chairmen, delegates to the national convention, officers of the convention and candidates for electors, chosen by the various districts were:¹⁰ (Numbers indicate districts.)

Resolutions

1. Samuel Crumbaker.
2. Dr. G. W. Williford.
3. E. C. Dufendach
4. John Overmeyer, Chr.
5. C. S. Eggleston.
6. R. G. Leeds.
7. Willets A. Bastian.
8. Rev. G. W. Schraeder.
9. Fay Cullens.
10. A. F. Knotts.
11. William N. Hasty.
12. Karl M. Newman.
13. Miller Guy.

Credentials

1. Rev. M. F. Bierbaum.
2. Wm. R. Williams.
3. J. S. Morgan.
- 4 William H. Newsom.
5. Henry Dorsett.
6. W. J. Hungate.
7. Bert Essex.
8. Charles Dalton.
9. J. W. Dwiggins.
10. Gustave Heat.
11. J. N. Harter.
12. Rudy F. Miller.
13. Edgar Bond.

Rules and Order

1. W. O. Bohannon.
2. Dr. H. R. Lowder.
3. Joseph Ben Herr.
4. William H. Clark.
5. Marion Owen.
6. Elmer Oldaker.
7. L. H. Van Briggles.
8. Robe Carl White.
9. Fred Randolph.
10. Herman Rogers.
11. Dr. M. A. Jordan.
12. E. B. Robinson.
13. J. M. Runyan.

District Chairmen

1. Monte M. Katterjohn.
2. Jos. H. Campbell.
3. Evan Prosser.
4. Fred Morgan.
5. Richard H. Crouch.
- 6 R. G. Leeds.
7. H. O. Chamberlin.
8. Clayte Sells.
9. William H. Dye.
10. Dr. G. R. Coffin.
11. Cornelius S. McGrevey.
12. Louis N. Littman.
13. F. E. Lambert.

Presidential Electors and Contingents

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Charles F. Smith. | U. H. Seiler. |
| 2. Dr. J. S. Gilkinson. | Marion E. Dugger. |
| 3. J. C. Brown. | Alvin Ward. |
| 4 Capt. W. H. Aiken. | O. E. Carter. |

¹⁰ Indianapolis *Star*, Aug. 1, 1912.

5. Louis McNutt.	Dr. Amos Carter.
6. Samuel Higginbotham.	F. W. Hamenway.
7. Edgar H. Evans.	Jos. K. Sharpe.
8. Al R. Lenich.	Homer Capp.
9. John T. Nixon.	David L. Brookie.
10. S. W. Thompson.	John Bower.
11. Carl S. Wise.	William C. Myers.
12. Dr. Chas. R. Clark.	Jas. M. Harvey.
13. W. J. Dillingham.	John C. Richter.

Vice Presidents

1. W. F. Adams.
2. Jos. E. Henley.
3. Dr. Stocker.
4. J. R. Overstreet.
5. Jas. H. Kerr.
6. Alonzo Havens.
7. Chas. M. Reagan.
8. Otis Judy.
9. J. W. Whicker.
10. A. B. Cray.
11. J. A. Brown.
12. William Longworth.
13. L. W. Bale.

Bull Moose spirit was never more in evidence than in the day of the party's state convention in Indianapolis. The Marion county delegation led by a military band marched from their headquarters to the convention (Tomlinson) hall. On the way they took occasion to serenade the Indianapolis *News*. After a load of little flags had been distributed the delegates were ready for the many demonstrations which followed. Roosevelt's picture hung just above the stage. Two mounted moose heads were displayed as a part of the elaborate decorations.

Mr. Lee as temporary chairman in making an opening address set forth the general frame of mind of those present. "Fellow Moosers," said he "we are here not at the call of any set of bosses. We are here for the birth of a new party and this party stands for social, civic, and political righteousness."¹¹

¹¹ Indianapolis *News*, Aug. 1, 1912.

In introducing Frederick Landis as temporary chairman, Mr. Lee referred to him as a man who had been "a pioneer for some time." The crowd cheered the speaker quite enthusiastically and when the Logansport man referred to Roosevelt as a leader strong enough "to take the government from Wall street back to Washington," an unusual demonstration resulted. After outlining the corrupt condition of the old parties, he proceeded to discuss the Progressive party's tariff views, commission form of city government, woman suffrage, the initiative, referendum and recall. Speaking of the recall he said: "We are not advocating the recall of judges this morning. We say judges must keep their hands clean. The constitution says all men shall have justice in the courts speedily and without delay, but they don't get it."

R. C. White, of Muncie, chairman of the committee on rules and order of business, read the report of that body. It recommended Horace C. Stilwell for permanent chairman. Harvey B. Stout, Jr., permanent secretary. The report was adopted as read.¹² One matter by way of innovation in Indiana state conventions, the selection of a state chairman of a political party by the same delegates who nominated candidates for office, was a striking feature of the report. The naming of the state chairman was placed last on the day's program.

Stilwell, after taking the chair proceeded to business without making a speech. In the roll of counties all were announced as represented by full delegations. The credentials committee report of no contests was adopted. As chairman of the resolutions committee, John Overmyer reported that the platform had been unanimously agreed to. The resolutions at first recommended a Bull Moose head as the party emblem. This was amended to read the Bull Moose instead of the head only. The object being to have "a live thing instead of a dead one." The platform declared for everything that had been preached as "Progressive." After declaring that the liquor question should not be in politics it recommended county option as a

¹² Indianapolis *News*, Aug. 1, 1912. Order of Business: 1. Call of counties by secretary; 2. Report of credentials and resolutions committees; 3. Selection of four delegates and four alternates at large to national convention; 4. Selection of a presidential elector and two contingent presidential electors at large; 5. Nomination of candidates for state offices; 6. Election of chairman for the Progressive state committee.

remedy for the evil until it could be settled by the initiative and referendum.

Beveridge was placed in nomination for governor by William D. Headrick. During the five minutes time allotted for such speeches Headrick eulogized his candidate as a man always battling for justice, asking no quarter and giving none; accepting no compromise with any enemy with which he was in a fight. He came as one single man to voice the sentiment of the people toward the famous senator who was "the greatest man in the greatest state in America." Motion for a unanimous vote carried by rising and cheers. Similarly the nomination of Fred Landis for lieutenant governor by J. F. Lawrence, of Peru, was made unanimous. Lawson N. Mace, of Scottsburg, was nominated for secretary of state after Solon Enloe, of Hendricks county, withdrew. Harvey E. Cushman, of Washington, a former clerk in the auditor's office, received the nomination for that office. For state treasurer Burdell B. Baker, of Monticello, was named, following the withdrawal of W. E. Vanarsdel, of Greencastle. Other nominations were Clifford F. Jackman, Huntington, for attorney general; Charles E. Spalding, of Winamac, for state superintendent; Thaddeus M. Moore, of Anderson, for state statistician; Frank R. Miller, of Clinton, for reporter of the supreme court; James B. Wilson, of Bloomington, for judge of the supreme court First district; William A. Bond, of Richmond, for judge of supreme court Fourth district; Minor F. Pate, of Bloomfield, for judge of the appellate court First district.

Beveridge in accepting his nomination declared that since he had been chosen to lead the fight he would lead it. He designated the effort as "a crusade for a cause and that cause the cause of the people." If elected he pledged that he would be a "free governor," that "no boss or anti-public influence" would stand between him and the people. "The people do not want things to go on as they have. Everybody knows that neither of the old parties can free American government of its boss system that is sucking out its life. Nothing can do it but a new party fresh from the people, and that is what the Progressive party is. I bid you now go forth and fight in the same spirit our fathers fought, and know that you are battling the greatest power the world has seen. You are fighting for

your fireside against all the vast wealth that has been unjustly wrung from the people."¹³

Former Senator Beveridge, E. M. Lee, R. G. Leeds, Fred Landis, H. C. Stilwell and Judge Perry Bear of Madison were named as delegates at large to the national convention. Harold Hobbs, of Muncie; William F. Adams, of Rockport; E. Warfel, of Richmond; Edgar Baldwin, of Fairmount; Carl Payne and W. D. Calvin, of the Second district, were named as alternate delegates at large. For presidential electors at large Aaron Jones, of South Bend; Lucius B. Swift, of Indianapolis; John Overmeyer, of North Vernon, and William L. Stahl, of Terre Haute, were placed in nomination. Two of these were to be elected, the others becoming contingent electors. Jones and Swift received the highest votes.

The platform as adopted by the convention contained many favorite measures of Colonel Roosevelt and former Senator Beveridge. In state affairs it recommended a conservation commission, trade and agricultural training schools, free school supplies for children, efficient child labor laws, a public utilities commission, workmen's compensation act, home rule for cities with power to adopt their own charters, competitive merit system in state and county civil service, reform of the court procedure, a state library and memorial building, a state inheritance tax, state aid and control of the main roads, the calling of a constitutional convention by the next legislature the delegates to be chosen by a direct popular vote, county local option as temporary relief on the liquor question.

The committee did not adjourn until four A. M. on the convention day. Certain interested parties visited the session in the hope of obtaining recognition of their ideas and claims. The woman suffrage delegation consisted of Dr. Hannah M. Graham, Mrs. A. M. Noe, Mrs. G. N. Carter and Dr. Mary Spink, officers of the Indiana Equal Suffrage association. Mrs. Anna Dunn Noland, President; W. A. Landgraf and George A. Mills represented the central labor union.

C. F. McGrevey, of Wabash, and Fred Landis asked for a good roads plank. Mr. McGrevey asked for an indorsement of a certain scheme as worked out by Clarence A. Kenyon, of

¹³ Indianapolis News, Aug. 1, 1912.

Indianapolis. The committee however decided upon a good roads plank but favored no particular plan. A more stringent tramp and vagrancy law was urged by J. W. Caswell, of Huntington.

The Republican defeat in Indiana two years before was attributed to the failure to put a local option clause in the party platform for that campaign. A sub-committee, consisting of Willitts A. Bastian, Rev. George W. Schraeder and Rudolph G. Leeds, appointed to investigate that issue, made its report at ten P. M. Early the Indiana Anti-Saloon League left an impression that the league would not support the new party, even if it should insert a strong county option plank in its platform, unless it refrained from nominating all officers of the state ticket except presidential electors. James E. Cox, of Oakland City, presented the message to the committee stating that he felt sure the league wouldn't support a third ticket under any circumstances.

The Progressives as a whole seemed to be in favor of state-wide prohibition, which is indicated by the plank finally adopted providing for the initiative and referendum as a final solution.¹⁴

With the selection of Edwin M. Lee as state chairman, the remarkable convention closed. A new party had been ushered into the field of Indiana politics, equipped with its own state ticket and electors. It was made up mostly of young professional and business men, educators and literary men. Others there were, who might have been classified as disgruntled office seekers, radical reformers and agitators. As one would naturally expect, such a composition must surely dissolve when a number of the measures advocated by it had been put upon the statute books. At this time however there seemed to be no relief in sight so that adherents to the new faith eagerly awaited further developments in the nation and state, the most immediate of which was the national convention at Chicago on August 5-7.

Interest in the national convention was shown by the fact that Indiana Progressives had requested tickets for almost one thousand persons from the state prior to July 26.¹⁵ Of

¹⁴ See Supplement for State Platform.

¹⁵ Statement of John F. Bass in charge of seat sale. *Indianapolis News*, July 29, 1912.

course all of these could not be given, and some individuals perhaps had asked for seat reservations who did not seriously contemplate the paying of ten to twenty-five dollars for it. The committee on local arrangements contemplated charging such a price for spectators in order to meet expenses.¹⁶ Former Senator Beveridge left for the "Windy City" on the night of August 1. As temporary chairman it was necessary that he go early to have everything in readiness for his keynote speech. Edwin M. Lee as state chairman left August 2 to attend a meeting of the national committee. Rudolph G. Leeds, of Richmond, was chosen by the Indiana delegation for the state's national committeeman; William D. Foulke, also of Richmond, for the resolutions committee; Joseph H. Campbell, of Bloomington, for rules committee, and Robe Carl White, of Muncie, for the permanent organization committee. Lucius B. Swift was elected chairman and David Rhodes, of Logansport, secretary of the state delegation. Dr. N. Foster received a place on the presidential notification committee, while W. J. Snyder, of Brazil, was named to help notify the vice-presidential nominee.

Shortly after noon on August 5 (Monday), Ralph C. Otis as temporary chairman of the Progressive national committee, called the convention to order. He soon presented the gavel to Senator Joseph M. Dixon who introduced Mr. Beveridge as the temporary chairman. The "keynote" as delivered by the former Hoosier senator, contained a severe indictment of the party system as it existed in our government. Moreover he set forth in a comprehensive way the Progressive plan for a rehabilitation of our national life.

Pleading for "a nobler America, an undivided nation, a broader liberty, a fuller justice", for "social brotherhood" against "savage individualism", for "intelligent cooperation" against "reckless competition", for "mutual helpfulness" instead of "mutual hatred", for "equal rights as a fact of life" and not "a party catch-word", for the "rule of the people as a practical truth" instead of a "meaningless pretense", and "representative government that represents", the Indiana

¹⁶ Indianapolis News, July 18, 1912.

man made clear his party's intention of "battling for the actual rights of man".

As for the Progressive program the speaker claimed it was one of construction. The party had grown from the soil of the people's hard necessities to do their work and abuse, ridicule and falsehood would only add to its growth. For years the people had been voting only to find their hopes turned to ashes on their lips. What we needed was a new alignment of our electorate along English lines, so that there would be the two divisions of liberals and conservatives or progressive and reactionary. Republican and Democratic legislators would no longer find it difficult to vote together merely because of a nominal difference in party membership. Under the then existing system bosses did not even work for their own parties but for "anti-public interests" whose servants they were. These "anti-public interests" constituted what Beveridge was pleased to call "the invisible government behind our visible government".

Furthermore our old parties had kept alive the spirit of sectionalism. The "tragedy" of our history had been continued. Men from the southland voted as "dead tradition and a local fear" instead of "conviction and national faith". It was the object of Progressives to break down this partition so that southerners could vote with northerners on our national problems.

In business the Progressives intended to tell the business men what they might do and what they might not do. Laws were to be made clear and not "foggy", stating plainly what things were criminal and what lawful. Another reform was proposed in the advocacy of a permanent tariff commission. Progressive theory held that the tariff should be high enough to give American producers the American market and low enough to enable foreign manufacturers a chance to compete in case American manufacturers made dishonest goods and dishonest prices.

The American government should control moral problems and conserve our resources both human and material. This done there was not the slightest doubt but what a "braver, fairer, cleaner, and purer America" would come; that "a

better and brighter life for all beneath the flag" would be achieved. "Those who now scoff soon will pray. Those who now doubt soon will believe, and soon the night will pass, and when to the sentinel on the ramparts of liberty the anxious ask 'Watchman what of the night?' his answer will be 'Lo the morn appeareth' ".¹⁷

The national convention was more of a ratification meeting than a convention. Those present knew what they wanted to do so they were not long in doing it. Another Indiana man who broke into the flame of oratory was Frederick Landis of Logansport, candidate for lieutenant governor of the state. His opportunity came in seconding the nomination of Gov. Hiram Johnson of California as the vice-presidential candidate. In the course of his remarks he gave the opinion that Indiana would go for Roosevelt by some 30,000 at the November election.¹⁸ The platform was thoroughgoing in its declaration of principles. It purported to be a real covenant with the people. Recommending an easier mode of amending the constitution, it proceeded to urge such amendments as popular election of United States senators, and presidential preference primaries giving voters the opportunity to nominate as well as to vote for candidates. Equal suffrage was indorsed and also legislation against corrupt practices, for the publicity of campaign expenditures and the improvement of public service. Other important planks were for the improvement of court procedure, the administration of justice both social and industrial, creation of a department of labor, improvement of country life, lowering the high cost of living, the improvement of health, regulation of business, patents and currency, an interstate commerce commission, further commercial development, good roads and waterways, inheritance and income taxes, parcels post, the extension of civil service regulations, movements toward peace as well as for national defense, and government supervision of investments.

Upon these principles and on the "recognized desirability" of uniting the progressive forces of the nation into an organization which would unequivocally represent the progressive

¹⁷ Indianapolis *News*, Aug. 5, 1912. *Star*, Aug. 6. Beveridge "Keynote."

¹⁸ Indianapolis *News*, Aug. 8, 1912.

spirit and policy, the Progressives appealed for the support of all American citizens, without regard to previous political affiliations.

The Indiana Republican state convention was held in Indianapolis, August 6. Most delegates sent up were uninstructed. At Carmel, Hamilton county, the Progressives claimed to have elected some as Moosers but the regulars denied the assertion. However it appeared that in Laurel and Blooming Grove townships the Bull Moosers took snap judgment on the regular Republicans (August 3) and went through the formality of selecting delegates to the Republican state convention. In Jeffersonville township, Clark county, a number of veteran leaders who had been absent for some four years, while the Beveridge men were in control, came out again for the fray. The regulars claimed that both factions would work in harmony again because many followers of the former Indiana senator had refused to follow him into the Bull Moose camp.^{18a}

James E. Watson made the keynote speech as temporary chairman. Referring to the new party he declared that it demanded "new methods, not new policies". Only two issues existed according to his interpretation. First the question of one man power and second the maintenance of constitutional government.

After a compromise on the primary election plank the resolutions committee found it possible to adopt the majority report in favor of county option. A woman's suffrage plank carried eight to five. Many of the planks were similar to those adopted by the Progressives. The recall of judges was not favored but rather a law looking toward the removal of incompetent officials. While the committee favored enforcement of the Sherman Anti-Trust act it also urged an amendment to clarify its provisions. The Chicago platform was approved.

By denouncing extravagance in the state administration, by favoring extension of the corrupt practices act, the limitation of the application of the new registration law, non-partisan management of state institutions, establishment of

^{18a} Indianapolis News, Aug. 5, 1912.

district work house, extension of public utilities commission to other public service corporations than the railroads, industrial and agricultural education, labor legislation with a commissioner of labor, an efficient inspection department, child labor laws, better sanitation, workmen's compensation act, pure food laws, commission form of city government, woman suffrage, good roads under state supervision and an auto tax, conservation and forestry in Indiana, a centennial building, and a constitutional convention, the resolutions were very progressive in their content.

Candidates for the gubernatorial nomination were numerous. Among those mentioned to head the ticket were David W. Henry and W. W. Parsons of Terre Haute, Ex-Governor W. T. Durbin of Anderson, Samuel L. Shank of Indianapolis, George B. Lockwood of Marion, Walter Olds of Fort Wayne, Charles A. Carlisle of South Bend, James Wade Emison of Vincennes, Addison C. Harris of Indianapolis, L. C. Embree of Princeton, Hugh T. Miller of Columbus and John C. Chaney of Sullivan. Out of this assortment Colonel Durbin was chosen. His success as a business man, his ability as an organizer and his financial record while in that office were counted upon to help him considerably in the campaign. The Anti-Saloon league ultimately give its support to his nomination.

As time passed by it became necessary for the Progressives to make up their minds definitely on the question of third party local tickets. Chairman Lee urged that candidates be nominated in every county but his constituents were about evenly divided as to the advisability of such a move. The general dread was due to a fear that the local Republican organization would be weakened. This was especially true in Lagrange, Noble, and Marion counties. Many of the regulars in these counties desiring above all else to keep the Democrats out, endeavored to show that it was a question of keeping local and national issues separated. In Democratic counties third tickets were opposed because there was little hope of victory with the Republican forces united. In Republican counties any weakening of Republican strength might mean defeat, but in these the Progressives had the greatest hope of success.

Spencer county led in the First district with a full Progressive ticket. Martin, Monroe and Morgan counties displayed the most third ticket sentiment in the Second district while Lawrence county, being the only Republican county in the Third hesitated from fear of Democratic triumph. Jefferson, Jennings, Decatur and Switzerland counties of the Fourth district showed a satisfaction with the regular Republican nominees. Putnam of the Fifth, and Fayette, Henry, Rush and Union counties of the Sixth district had been centers of Bull Moose activity but third tickets were not looked upon there with much favor. Wayne county in the latter district with a strong Progressive organization was able to put out a successful ticket. Henry county finally put up nominees but they were not able to get as much as second place. Boone, Carroll, Clinton, Hamilton and Tipton counties of the Ninth district nominated tickets. Lake, Porter and White counties were the only ones in the Tenth district to name local candidates. Madison and Delaware counties led the Eighth district in the new venture, being followed by Randolph. In the Eleventh district a strong fight was made for a third ticket in Cass, Miami, Grant, Huntington and Wabash counties but it failed in the two last named. Blackford being so strongly Democratic received but little attention. The Twelfth district was almost as unanimous against third party tickets as it was for Roosevelt delegates to the Republican national convention. A peculiar situation existed in the Thirteenth district where the Republican county committee in control of the Progressives insisted upon no further nominations than those already made by the old party. Laporte county was Democratic but put up a ticket as did Elkhart and Fulton. Elsewhere no leadership developed to bring out additional candidates.

THE CAMPAIGN

Tickets having been made up by the various parties they were ready to begin an active canvass for votes. Indiana as usual would be one of the fiercest battlefields. The Progressive leaders planned four general headquarters from which to direct the national campaign. These were at Chicago, New York, New Orleans and San Francisco. Indiana

naturally came under the supervision of the Chicago center but the state also had a representative in the New York office so that the fight to control the state was directed from both places.¹⁹

The campaign was not altogether of the "clap-trap" variety neither did it have "gum shoe" characteristics. It was preeminently an educational program.²⁰ More individuals took an active interest in the issues than was usual for Indiana. The Democrats especially were out in force being encouraged by the hope of victory. It pleased them also to see all opponents thrive so they gave encouragement to each one.²¹

Frank B. Doudican of Indianapolis had charge of the speakers' bureau at the Bull Moose state headquarters. Some speakers on his list were Clifford F. Jackman of Huntington, George W. Thompson of Bluffton, Thomas A. Daily, George W. Galvin, W. D. Headrick and W. H. Van Briggles of Indianapolis, Judges James B. Wilson of Bloomington and T. J. Terhune of Linton, William D. Foulke and Rudolph G. Leeds of Richmond, Frederick Landis of Logansport and Albert J. Beveridge, nominee for governor.

Chairman E. M. Lee sent out a call for a meeting of the state committee and party workers at the state headquarters on August 30. At this time the leaders had a general discussion of conditions over the state and made plans for the campaign. A number of county chairmen, vice-chairmen, and secretaries also attended. The campaign was expected to be a costly one so that an appeal went out to the uttermost parts of the state for money. Contributions were to be sent to J. F. Wild who was treasurer of the state committee.

Colonel Roosevelt visited Indiana twice for short speeches. On September 3, following the Vermont campaign, he passed through the state via Muncie, Indianapolis and Terre Haute on his way to Illinois. He was enthusiastically received at each stop, many admirers crowding into the Union station at Indianapolis in order to see him. Frank H. Funk, of Bloomington, Illinois, candidate for governor of that state, and

¹⁹ Indianapolis *News*, Aug. 14, 1912.

²⁰ Logan Esarey, *History of Indiana*, II, p. 1060.

²¹ Indianapolis *News*, Sept. 25, 1912.

Chauncey Dewey of Chicago boarded the train to accompany their leader on the remainder of his trip to St. Louis.

Later, on October 4, the former President spoke briefly at Gary. Party managers had planned for him to return for at least one large meeting in Indiana in order to keep certain voters from falling out of line. The date for this meeting was fixed as October 15. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Roosevelt was wounded by a shot fired by a would-be assassin, John Schrank, just outside the Gilpatric Hotel in Milwaukee, on the evening preceding his Indiana engagement. Mr. Beveridge filled an appointment for him at Louisville, October 16, and made a pathetic appeal concerning the wounded chief.

Plans were made by the speakers' bureau for Governor Hiram Johnson of California to make a tour of the state beginning at Terre Haute on the night of September 18, and to include seven congressional districts. Speeches were made the following day (September 19) at Sullivan, Vincennes, Princeton, Evansville, Oakland City, Washington, Mitchell, Bedford, Bloomington, Martinsville and Indianapolis. A tour for the next day to include Noblesville, Tipton, Kokomo, Marion, Anderson and Richmond was cancelled by the governor who proceeded into New England expecting to return to California in October. Landis and William Headrick substituted for the vice-presidential nominee, explaining as the Republicans said "Why Johnson left Indiana so suddenly".²² Speeches made by the Californian in southern Indiana during his tour were replete with utterances of political irony bordering upon sarcasm.

Albert J. Beveridge, for twelve years United States senator from Indiana, this year the Progressive nominee for governor, made a brilliant campaign for that office. Good audiences greeted him in practically all parts of the state. His championship of the new party's cause, coupled with a recognized oratorical ability and his strong personal following help to account for this. In the beginning he emphasized the need of organization. He intended to give the best he had to the cause and expected others to do likewise. Many of his

²² *Indianapolis News*, Sept. 20, 1912. *Indianapolis Star*, Sept. 20, 1912.

speeches were made at the various district nominating conventions of the party. The gist of his thoughts was that the Progressive policies should be indorsed by the people since the old line parties were corrupt and could not be trusted to carry out any pledges which they might make.

In the course of his speech at Portland, September 10, he was interrupted by Sumner W. Haynes of that city and candidate on the Prohibition ticket for judge of the supreme court, who asked why the Bull Moosers had copied in their platform so much from the platform of the Prohibitionists. In reply the former senator said "many good things have appeared in the Prohibitionist platform for the last twenty years and I do not regard them as the property of any party".²³

The real opening speech of Beveridge's campaign was made in Tomlinson Hall, Indianapolis, on September 7. He declared that the "Boss System" in Indiana had "kept on the statute books the railway road tax law by which out of one hundred dollars the railroads are supposed to pay we get fifteen dollars worth of poor work done on our roads". The argument for good roads was frequently used in the northern part of the state. Congressman William E. Cox of the Third district claimed to be the pioneer in the good roads movement and accused Mr. Beveridge as being a late convert, but at any rate the evil still existed.

Another evil which the ex-Senator asked to have remedied was the existing method of supplying school books. He urged free books to all children. An Indianapolis *News* editorial²⁴ attacked this proposal as tending to tax the poor in order to buy books for wealthy children.

At Logansport, September 14, where one-third of the audience was women Beveridge reiterated the Progressive plea for woman suffrage. Mrs. Anna B. Noland, president of the State Suffragist association made a short speech just before he was introduced. On the previous evening Mrs. W. Reed, secretary of the Warsaw school board had presented him to the audience there. Before the Franchise league at Tomlinson Hall, September 16, the candidate pledged himself to work for many kinds of social reforms. "Trust me for

²³ Indianapolis *News*, Sept. 10, 1912.

²⁴ Indianapolis *News*, Oct. 8, 1912.

it when I say, that I am going to be called the fighting governor of Indiana if the people of the state elect me to the office", was his statement to a Tipton audience, September 14.²⁵

The trusts were discussed in his speeches at Valparaiso, Laporte and South Bend. "We could not destroy big business concerns if we would and should not if we could". Speaking of the steel trust, Mr. Beveridge declared against breaking it up by saying "I do not believe the plan is any more feasible than to cut off a man's legs, his hands and his head and then by some kind of hocus-pocus in the form of legal enactment tell him to go and make a success of himself".²⁶

The leading features of the Democratic campaign were the active canvass made by Samuel M. Ralston, candidate for governor, and the tactful use made of Woodrow Wilson's brief visits. Mr. Ralston began his speechmaking on August 30, at Anderson where he read a carefully prepared paper giving the Democratic tariff and finance doctrine. Platforms and administrations of his opponents received their share of criticism but personalities were avoided. Romus F. Stuart, of the Democratic state speakers' bureau arranged a full schedule for the Lebanon man which took him into all parts of the state. He seldom neglected to mention the tariff in his speeches. In state politics he maintained that his party had enacted a school book and tax law in spite of strenuous Republican opposition. On September 30, he was so impressed with the hope of triumph as to declare: "They can't beat me, I am having fine meetings. I have been practically all over the state, and I find Democratic prospects excellent."²⁷

Woodrow Wilson made some brief addresses while passing through the state on September 16, chief among them being at Hartford City and Logansport. On the nineteenth of the month he stopped at Michigan City, long enough to shake hands with a number of admirers, while en route to Detroit. Later on, October 3, he appeared to an exceptionally large gathering in Indianapolis at the Washington ball park. He had come to make an address at the National Conservation

²⁵ Indianapolis News, Sept. 16, 1912.

²⁶ Indianapolis News, Sept. 19, 1912.

²⁷ Indianapolis News, Sept. 30, 1912.

Congress then in session. On the following day he proceeded northward making speeches at Kokomo and Peru.

William J. Bryan permitted the use of his talents in the Indiana fight from October 16 to 18. Ollie James, a Kentucky senator, spoke on October 5 at Vincennes and Evansville. On September 27 Senator Thomas P. Gore of Oklahoma arrived in Indianapolis from Battle Creek, Michigan, for a general "whoop-'em-up" meeting at Tomlinson Hall. The blind senator argued for support of the principles of Democracy. There were according to his version three kinds of Progressives (1) those infatuated by Roosevelt's personality; (2) those who in the fortunes of war and in the vicissitudes of politics, had fallen outside the breastworks of the regular Republican party; and (3) those who believed the new party offered an avenue of reform. Some of the latter were "Democrats without courage".²⁸

Other Democratic speakers were Senator John W. Kern and Benjamin Shively who while not seeking reelection were anxious to see Wilson carry the state and with it the full quota of Democratic congressmen. Former government chemist Dr. Harvey W. Wiley of Indiana, who had heretofore been a Republican came out in this campaign for Wilson. He began a five days speaking tour October 2, at Greencastle.

The Republican state committee held a conference at Indianapolis, September 4, to make plans for the campaign. They determined upon an aggressive effort throughout the state. All county committees were to be purged of Progressive members. Fred S. Buggie, an elector from the Sixth district, was removed because of being a Bull Mooser.²⁹ In an address to the people the committee asked why anyone should desert the grand old party that had done so much for the country. It was announced that Colonel W. T. Durbin would deliver the keynote of his campaign at Marion, September 12.

In his opening address Mr. Durbin endeavored to show that the country was prosperous under Republican rule. The last twelve years of its supremacy in Indiana were referred to as a period in which the state's business was economically administered and when its institutions flourished under non

²⁸ Indianapolis *News* and *Star*, Sept. 28, 1912.

²⁹ Indianapolis *Star*, Sept. 5, 1912; Indianapolis *News*, Sept. 4, 1912.

partisan administration. "We can clean our own house, and we do not have to tear down the foundations to do it. If there are bed bugs in the temple of liberty (as Beveridge has intimated) let us use insect powder and not dynamite".³⁰ During the greater part of October the former governor visited practically every nook and corner of the state south of Indianapolis using his automobile most of the time.

The work in each district was largely in the hands of its organization consisting of the chairman, the nominee for congress and one or more experienced organization men from within the district or elsewhere. The Republican orators who came into the state were directed by these local organizations while within their jurisdiction. Some of these visitors were Warren G. Harding, of Ohio; Richard H. Langford, of Nebraska; P. T. Colgrove, of Michigan; Senator Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio; Representative Philip P. Campbell, of Kansas; Ebenezer J. Hill, of Connecticut; Alexander C. Rankin, of Chicago; Julius C. Burrows of Michigan; Dr. Samuel Blair, of Missouri; Mahlon M. Garland, of Pittsburgh; and secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson. These speakers were selected because of their particular fitness to discuss certain subjects. Mr. Campbell and Mr. Hill for example were on the "tariff special", which trailed Wilson, and which followed him north from Indianapolis after his visit on October 3 and 4.³¹ Some of Indiana's best home talent added to the fireworks from the stump. The list included in addition to congressional nominees, former Vice-president Charles W. Fairbanks; former Governor J. Frank Hanly; Ed Jackson, candidate for secretary of state; Charles A. Carlisle, Ele Stansbury candidate for attorney general, John C. Chaney of Sullivan, James F. Stutesman of Peru, and former Representative James E. Watson.

In the First district the campaign centered about the congressional race between Charles Lieb, Democrat, of Rockport; Daniel Ortmeier, Republican of Evansville and Humphrey C. Heldt, Progressive of Oakland City. Oscar Bland, Republican, made a strong effort to dislodge Representative W. A. Cullop in the Second district. John Napier Dyer was

³⁰ *Indianapolis News*, Sept. 12, 1912.

³¹ *Indianapolis News*, Oct. 5, 1912.

the Progressive candidate. No spectacular efforts resulted in either the Third, Fourth or Fifth districts where there was little chance for Republican or Progressive success.

The Progressive cause in the Sixth district was handicapped because of the third ticket difficulty. Moreover the party there had trouble in securing a nominee for congress whose past record would not be criticised. Joseph A. Greenstreet was first chosen. Charges were brought against his business integrity while he was connected with the Charter Oak Handle Company of Richmond some years ago. At a meeting, September 7, Mr. Greenstreet offered to resign in the interest of harmony. His friends urged him to withhold his formal resignation until a meeting of the district committee, September 14, in Connersville. On the latter date his attorney W. R. Steele, who appeared with him, announced that his client refused to withdraw. The committee however declared that the former verbal resignation had been accepted and set September 23 as the date for another district convention to be held there, at which time a successor would be named. Gierluf Jansen, of Greenfield, a former Methodist minister, was chosen to head the congressional ticket when the convention met on the date fixed by the district committee. Finley H. Gray, the Democratic nominee for reelection, merely rested on his oars, for the rift in the Republican party meant almost certain victory. William L. Risk of New Castle headed the Republican ticket. At the Henry county Progressive convention not a little disorder was experienced when members from five different townships bolted, forming an "Independent Progressive Party". Cries of "machine", "Road Roller" and "Bossism" were reported because of objections to nominating a third county ticket. Mr. Greenstreet, who on the day before had been discarded as the party's candidate for congress, was named for Representative from the county.³²

Similar difficulty was experienced in the Seventh district, when it came to selecting a congressional candidate. In the nominating convention, September 14, Harry O. Chamberlin, U. Z. Wiley, Henry Riesenberg, W. D. Headrick, John F. Geck-

³² Indianapolis *Star*, Sept. 25, 1912; Indianapolis *News*, Sept. 24, 1912.

ler, and Willetts A. Bastian were placed in nomination. Wiley was nominated on the second ballot over Geckler after the other men had withdrawn. Some opposition to Wiley soon developed because of an alleged "unclean" record as a lawyer and judge. He declined the nomination therefore in a letter to county chairman Chamberlin.³³ John V. Zartman was the strongest opponent of Mr. Geckler for the vacant place when the district convention met in September to make another nomination. The records of both men were thoroughly scanned and Zartman received the prize by a vote of 106 to 34. Election returns showed that he was one of the three Progressive congressional candidates to run second in the November election.³⁴

E. C. Toner, editor of the *Anderson Herald* was nominated for congress by the Progressives of the Eighth district, August 27, at Muncie. His opponents in the campaign were Representative J. A. M. Adair (Democrat) of Portland, and Isaac P. Watts (Representative) of Winchester. Progressive strength in the more populous counties enabled him to poll a substantial vote for second place.³⁵

John F. Neil of the Hamilton county circuit court led the Progressives in the Ninth district. The Republicans and Democrats made vigorous campaigns and as elsewhere the third ticket issue figured against the Noblesville man. In the Tenth district Democratic unity and the personal popularity of Edgar D. Crumpacker, former Republican Representative tended to diminish the support given to John O. Bowers of White county as the Progressive nominee.

The Progressives made a fair campaign in the Eleventh and Twelfth districts. In the former Edgar M. Baldwin was nominated for congress when the party convention met at Peru, September 11. Leroy Johnson of Logansport and Rev. William E. Shafer of Bunker Hill were his opponents for the nomination. Baldwin was editor of the *Fairmount News*. Louis N. Littman of Lagrange led the Twelfth district Progressive offensive. Although he had a good following in his own and Allen counties the majority of former Republicans

³³ *Indianapolis News*, Sept. 23, 1912.

³⁴ *Report of Secretary of State*, 1912, 119.

³⁵ *Report of Secretary of State*, 1912, 120.

evidently preferred to vote regular when it came to that office.³⁶ The Thirteenth district gave Dr. R. Clarence Stephens of Plymouth, second place on election day as the Progressive congressional nominee. He received however only 37 more votes than Charles A. Carlisle, the Republican candidate. Henry A. Barnhart, Democratic candidate for re-election was returned by a plurality of 11,144.³⁷

Democratic success was almost entirely complete. The Republican split enabled that party to elect a complete state ticket. Samuel M. Ralston was elected governor with 275,357 votes as against 166,124 for Mr. Beveridge and 142,850 for Colonel Durbin. The personal following commanded by the Progressive leader is evident from a comparison of the above vote with that for the first presidential elector, he having received over 4,000 more votes than were cast for Roosevelt in the state.³⁸

John W. Judkins had the honor of being the only Progressive elected to the General Assembly. He was elected from Wayne county, one of the strongest centers of Progressivism in the state. The new party made a fair showing also in the Dekalb, Delaware, Clark, Crawford, Fayette, Floyd, Hancock, Johnson, Kosciusco, Lake, Lawrence, Madison, Marion, Miami, St. Joseph, Vigo and Wabash county elections.³⁹

The upheaval had seriously affected only one party, the Republican. That party was about evenly divided. Its local candidates as a rule polled more votes than the Progressives. Men who had formerly voted the Socialist or Prohibitionist tickets did not make a change this year. In fact each of these showed gains, the former annexing some 23,455 adherents.⁴⁰ No doubt some independent voters supported that ticket for such voters are not backward in doing so if their own party doesn't hew to the line of reform and persists in following old time methods which are objectionable to these discriminating and obstinate voters.

For some reason the total vote in Indiana fell short about 66,653 of that cast in 1908. There should rather have been

³⁶ *Report of Secretary of State*, 1912, 121.

³⁷ *Report of Secretary of State*, 1912, 121.

³⁸ *Report of Secretary of State*, 1912, 93.

³⁹ *Vote for Electors, Report of Secretary of State*, 1908-12.

⁴⁰ *Indianapolis News*, Nov. 6, 1912.

a material increase during the four year period of about 35,000. Different reasons have been assigned for the slump. Illegal voting in 1908 may have exaggerated the poll of that year, yet in spite of the heated campaign and the vigorous efforts by the parties an unexpected apathy developed among the voters. Under the new registration law of that year some 743,000 had registered, of these a number were illegally enrolled. To offset the number of illegal registrants party leaders estimated that perhaps as many as 50,000 men failed to register at all. Again, the combined Republican and Progressive votes amounted to 313,274 or 31,384 in excess of the Democratic total. This was 25,719 less than the Republicans mustered in 1908, while the Democratic loss was 56,372.⁴¹

The position of the Progressive candidates on the ballot was the same as that formerly held by the People's party, being fourth place, following the Prohibitionists. At their national convention, August 13, at St. Louis, the Populists had adopted a platform which the Progressives had already anticipated with the exception of direct issuance of money to people, and the granting of franchises by popular votes. When that party, therefore, decided not to make the fight the Progressives very appropriately took its position on the ballot and no doubt a large per cent of its votes⁴².

Anti-liquor forces were very active during the campaign. Many opposed T. R. Marshall as Democratic candidate for Vice-President because the state contained more "wet" territory under his administration than during the Hanly regime.⁴³ Eugene W. Chafin of Arizona and Aaron S. Watson of Ohio were nominees of the Prohibition party for President and Vice-President. From headquarters at South Bend the former conducted an energetic campaign throughout the northern part of the state. Prohibitionists remained true to their party and their increased strength indicated little divergence into the other ranks.

As has been previously suggested the Socialists as a rule voted as they were accustomed. They had hopes of polling a heavy vote if the members could be kept in line. The

⁴¹ *Secretary of State Reports*, 1908 and 1912.

⁴² *Indianapolis News*, Aug. 14, 1912.

⁴³ *Indianapolis News*, July 3, 1912.

national convention nominating Eugene V. Debs for President and Emil Seidel for Vice-President was held at Indianapolis, May 12-13. Mr. Debs was from Terre Haute and had a large following throughout the state.

Stephen M. Reynolds, candidate for governor, in a speech at Petersburg, Indiana, July 11, clearly set forth his party's attitude toward the Republicans, Progressives and Democrats. They opposed the Progressives and blamed Republican leaders for the condition of their party. So far as Bryan's victory in securing Wilson's nomination was concerned, it was destined to a short life for the big interests would soon gain control of the Democratic machinery.⁴⁴ The Socialists could therefore see no hope in either of the old parties so they voted straight.

The State Alliance of German societies in session at Lafayette, September 2, denounced the Bull Moose stand on local option. President Joseph Keller said:

We will never rest until the temperance question is taken out of politics. This may be done by fighting those political parties that insist on keeping it in politics. We are against it now as we were four years ago when we defeated county option. We will never bury the hatchet until county option is dead. Two parties in Indiana have put it into their platforms and we will fight them both. This does not mean that we are all Democrats for a majority of the delegates here today are Republicans. We are against Hanlyism in every form.⁴⁵

In a resolution adopted at the meeting, members of the Alliance were admonished to vote for neither Progressive nor Republican candidates on the state ticket.

The Woman Suffrage issue did not influence the Indiana vote to any marked extent because since it had not been granted in this state the women could not express any preferences at the polls. They could merely agitate and this they did, not however in favor of one party to the exclusion of all others. The Woman's Franchise league made an active publicity campaign in favor of their cause. The members declared that they would support those candidates who were in favor of giving women the right to vote and oppose those who were not so disposed. It was a case of supporting friendly candidates

⁴⁴ Indianapolis News, July 12, 1912.

⁴⁵ Quoted in Indianapolis News, Sept. 2, 1912.

and not parties.⁴⁶ There were national suffrage organizations behind each of the three leading tickets so that no one could fail to detect their divided allegiance. Miss Alice Carpenter, of Brookline, Massachusetts, and Miss Frances I. Keller, of Brooklyn, New York, headed the one allied with the Progressives. Mrs. Borden Harriman that with the Democrats and Miss Helen V. Baswell that with the Republicans.⁴⁷ The Progressives of Indiana gave more heed to suffrage argument than either of its antagonists. Mr. Beveridge seldom failed to speak in its favor in his lengthy speeches. On September 16 he delivered the main oration before a suffrage meeting in Tomlinson hall where he had opened his campaign on the 5th, with Dr. Amelia R. Keller, President of the Franchise league, as temporary chairman.

More than ordinary publicity was given Progressive doctrine during the campaign. The *Toledo Blade*, *Cleveland Leader*, *Chicago Post* and *Louisville Herald* had some readers in the state to absorb Progressive sentiment from their pages. On August 20 Chairman Lee called Bull Moose editors to Indianapolis in order to form an Editorial association. B. R. Inman of the *Middletown News*, who had charge of promoting the organization, was elected president of it. Edgar M. Baldwin of the *Fairmount News* was named as his assistant. Mr. Inman claimed forty editors would support the cause besides about twenty-five more giving partial support. Some Republican editors, declared the president, had written to him declaring that they would be for a Republican county ticket but would support the Bull Moose national ticket and vice versa. Before adjourning, a constitution, by-laws and resolutions to be followed by the new party press were agreed upon. Progressive papers in the state in addition to those mentioned were the *Anderson Herald*, *Progressive News* (Marion), *Grandview Monitor*, *Morning News* from press of *Crawfordsville Review* (brief existence), *National Progressive* of Bedford, the *White County Progressive* of Monticello and a Progressive organ for Boone county published at Lebanon.

It is almost as difficult to explain the source of Progressive voters as that of the proverbial wind. Most of them were

⁴⁶ *Indianapolis News*, Aug. 12, 1912.

⁴⁷ *Indianapolis News*, Sept. 6, 1912.

Republicans as the abstract of the vote shows. Some Democrats gave their votes to the cause but it would not be safe to assume that a very large number did so. The chance for the success of their own party, under a leader whom they considered progressive, was too great for them to disregard. Had Democracy been led by a recognized reactionary there is no doubt but that the verdict of November 5 would have been different. As it was the Progressive movement reached the summit of its strength within thirteen weeks of its inauguration as a separate political organization.

The public generally was content with the results. The Democratic party had been reinstated with complete control of practically all departments of government. It was now expected to use that control wisely. The Republicans felt that they were merely repulsed but not whipped. They were not dispersed, but hoped in time to be reinforced and even in the next fight to win.⁴⁸ Progressives felt about the same about it. Governor Johnson expressed their belief by referring to the result as "of little more consequence to the ultimate success of earnest men than was the missing of a train."⁴⁹ Sincere and earnest Progressives were already beginning to plan for the future. If a longer time and a more complete organization of party machinery were necessary for success they were resolved to take advantage of both.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS OF 1913 and CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN OF 1914.

Before the enthusiasm aroused by the recent campaign had time to wane, Progressive leaders started to rally their forces for a second encounter. On November 28 a meeting was held in Castle hall, Indianapolis, the Marion county headquarters. Precinct and ward committeemen attended. Willitts A. Bastian as county chairman had appointed a committee to outline a plan for maintaining in power the existing county organization.

⁴⁸ *Indianapolis News*, Durbin's comment, Nov. 25, 1912.

⁴⁹ *Indianapolis News*, Nov. 8, 1912.

The committee consisting of Taylor Groninger, Harry Chamberlin, Thomas A. Daily, Z. V. Zartman and W. D. Headrick reported a scheme whereby the 1912 officials would have charge of the city campaign of 1913. These resolutions were adopted as presented and provided: That the county chairman continue as temporary chairman of the city committee with full power to appoint and remove members or make any changes; that no compromise or fusion with any other party should be made but that a separate organization should be maintained; that a full city ticket should be nominated in 1913, the Progressives demanding their rights and prerogatives in all coming elections and in all future county or city bipartisan appointments. To support the management a movement was started to get two hundred workers to give twenty-five dollars each toward a general fund.¹

At a meeting of the Madison county Progressive club, December 5, Horace C. Stilwell vice-chairman of the state central committee read a draft of rules to govern the new party in Indiana. These rules were drawn up by a sub-committee of the state committee, of which Stilwell was a member, and were to be submitted to the state organization for adoption, December 16.²

Before the state central committee met to consider reorganization measures a national Progressive conference was held at Chicago, December 1911. Albert J. Beveridge delivered the principal address on the night of December 10. An ad-

¹ *Indianapolis News*, Nov. 29, 1912.

² *Indianapolis News*, Dec. 6, 1912. Rules to be submitted by the sub-committee: The state committee should consist of fifteen members, one from each congressional district and two at large. District, county and township rules were practically the same as those then in use. For city committees, provision was made for ward organizations with chairman, secretary and treasurer for each. Precinct committeemen were to elect congressional chairman instead of township delegates. For the city organization the rules provided precinct elections be held on the second Tuesday of February each year of a city election; that the precinct committeeman shall meet on the first Thursday after the second Tuesday of February, and again on Saturday following to elect chairmen, secretaries and treasurers of the city committees.

For the county organization precinct committeemen were to meet on the second Tuesday of each January of the even numbered years, the district organization to be effected on the third Tuesday of January of every even-numbered year; the county organization to be perfected on the first Saturday after the second Tuesday in January. The resolutions provided for the recall of any committee for specific reasons such as, the unlawful use of money, use of position for factional or partisan purposes, unfair means on elections, or interference with affairs of the party or of any Progressive.

dress by Mr. Roosevelt showed that the Progressive goal was to defeat the Democrats if possible. In order to do this steps were taken to inaugurate what was called the "Progressive Service" of six bureaus.³ By introducing Progressive measures through this "service" they hoped to make the Democrats either accept or reject them in either case to the advantage of the new party.

The Progressive state committee meeting on December 16 adopted the plan of organization drawn up by its sub-committee.⁴ Taking a cue from the Chicago conference's action of the previous week, a legislative committee of thirty members was selected to work for Progressive legislation in Indiana.⁵ E. A. Rumley of Laporte and W. C. Bobbs of Indianap-

³ *Indianapolis News*, Dec. 10, 1912. The following were the six bureaus to be organized: 1. Education and publicity, press, literature, speakers, party literature, speakers, party bulletins, special and college work. 2. Legislative reference research, drafting bills and legislation. 3. Social and industrial service having supervision of persons and movements for labor, children, social insurance and immigration. 4. Conservation of national resources, health, country, life, corporations, tariff and taxation. 6. Popular government, direct legislation, suffrage, judicial reform, economy and efficiency. *News*, Dec. 12. The conference also decided: 1. To establish national headquarters at New York and a branch at Washington. 2. To establish a legislative reference bureau under a committee of three appointed by the executive committee. 3. To adopt the initiative of measures by twenty-five per cent. of the national committee members and the recall of national officers by a majority vote of the committee. Such recommendations also made for state organizations. 5. That the Progressive party invites all members of all legislatures to join in the support of progressive measures and men. 4. That the national executive committee arrange the states into compact, convenient, geographical divisions and provide for organization and conferences of national committeemen, state chairmen and other officials of each such division. 6. That a commission of seven be appointed by the national chairman to go to Europe in the summer of 1913, to investigate social legislation with regard to both agricultural and industrial conditions (two for agriculture, two for labor, one economics professor, two general). 7. To announce a meeting of the national committee in New York, December 18 and 19 to consider any business coming before it.

⁴ See note 2.

⁵ The following persons were selected as members of this committee: Rev. Francis H. Gavisk, Mrs. Caleb S. Denny, W. K. Stewart, Lucius B. Swift, Carl Mote, George W. Stout, W. A. Bastian, Robert L. Breakenburr, Carl G. Fisher, Oscar L. Pond, Edward R. Lewis, Dr. Amelia R. Keller, Thomas C. Howe and C. B. Coleman, of Indianapolis; Judge James B. Wilson, Dr. Amos A. Hershey and Dr. James A. Woodburn, of Bloomington; Judge William A. Bond and William D. Foulke, of Richmond; T. E. Moran and Dr. W. K. Hiatt, of Lafayette; Dr. C. C. North, of Greencastle; Charles F. Smith, of Evansville; Clifford Jackman, of Huntington; W. J. Snyder, of Brazil; Dr. W. A. Mills, of Hanover; Dr. Edward Rumley, of Laporte; John G. Brown, of Monon; E. C. Toner, of Anderson; Carl A. Wise, of Logansport; Charles A. Bash, of Fort Wayne, and David Waugh, of Tipton. This committee was to have charge of the preparation of bills embodying the planks of the Progressive state platform for introduction in the General Assembly.

olis were named with B. R. Inman of Middletown as a committee to organize clubs throughout the state. Members of these clubs were to pay dues of about twenty-five cents a month, ten cents of which would go into the state campaign fund.

The Progressives felt that their defeat in 1912 was largely due to the fact that they entered the campaign too late. Their organization was considered inadequate. But since they polled more votes than the Republicans for their state and presidential ticket there seemed to be sufficient cause for further effort. This led to the party's participation in the municipal elections of 1913. The leaders felt that it was imperative for their party to be represented in all political activities so that the rank and file of the voters would not become indifferent or deserters.⁶ Within a week of the election of 1912, therefore, there was some talk of city tickets where the new move made the strongest showing. At Anderson, Clayte Sells, Progressive chairman of the Eighth district, was prominently mentioned for mayor. At Richmond where the new party had carried all but three precincts the fight was to be continued.⁷

The Indianapolis mayoralty race was one of more than ordinary interest. Dr. William H. Johnson was the Progressive nominee. He had been a city councilman and was familiar with the problems of the capital. During his campaign he advocated "majority rule," and giving the "ordinary citizen representation at the city hall." In order to bring about such reforms civic centers would be established at the school houses in each ward where the people could meet to consider matters pertaining to their own wards and the general welfare." "I want to make the city government a family affair instead of a government by ring politicians," Johnson is quoted as saying.⁸ Certain other reforms urged by the Progressives included the nonassessment of city employees for campaign expenses, no more acceptance of corporation money for campaign funds, a reasonable return for taxes instead of paying out the money for salaries, in other words, driving the politi-

⁶ Indianapolis *News*, Nov. 9, 1912.

⁷ Indianapolis *News*, Nov. 9, 1912.

⁸ Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 2, 1913.

cal chair warmers out. As a surety for carrying out these measures Johnson offered to forfeit one thousand dollars for charity and resign his office if he failed to carry out any of his campaign pledges.⁹

The Republican candidate was former Mayor Charles A. Bookwalter. He had been mayor from 1905 to 1909 and also from 1901 to 1903. In 1899 and 1903 he had been a candidate each time being defeated by the Democratic nominee. All that a mayor could do to make Indianapolis a "Progressive" city he promised to do if elected. His campaign opened with much "red fire" in a mass meeting at Tomlinson hall on the night of October 1. A platform urging economy, law enforcement, flood prevention, park development, boulevard building, better care of streets, better street lighting, efficient municipal boards, civil service for fire and police departments, an effort to increase the number of industries, the development of technical school for education along practical lines, track elevation, sewage disposal plant, construction of a convention hall, cross-town street car lines and protection of public health was adopted.¹⁰

The Democrats placed Joseph E. Bell in the race. His election was urged as an indorsement of the state and national Democratic administrations. The Prohibitionists, Socialists and Socialist Labor parties also nominated tickets; in addition to this Dr. Charles S. Woods was nominated to oppose the field on a citizen's ticket.

Shelbyville citizens held a mass meeting on October 1 at which they nominated a city ticket. Of the thirty-five delegates the Democrats, Republicans and Progressives had ten each while the Prohibitionists had five. Robert W. Harrison, a former mayor and a Democrat, was nominated to head the ticket. For clerk Lee Morgan, a Republican, was named. I. O. Mann and Martin Lemmon, both Progressives, received places for councilmen at large, while among the ward councilmen selected were two Republicans, two Progressives and one Democrat. The new party had already nominated a ticket including the names of Mann and Lemmon but this was withdrawn after the mass meeting had given them recognition.¹¹

⁹ Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 8, 1913..

¹⁰ Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 2, 1913.

¹¹ Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 2, 1913.

A committee was appointed to name a fusionist candidate for mayor of Muncie. Three names were suggested including George W. Wilson a Progressive, W. T. Janney a Republican and Word Marshall a Democrat. Wilson was selected after the other men withdrew.¹² In the election however Wilson was defeated by Mr. Bunch the regular Democratic candidate. The regular Republican and Progressive nominees were Mr. Broderick and Mr. Kitselman.

Non-partisan or citizen tickets were placed in the field at Fort Wayne, Gary and Lafayette where they opposed the regular Democratic ticket. Progressives entered the fight with much zest at Elkhart, Gosben, Bloomington, Richmond and Terre Haute. At the latter city law and order was the main issue.

When the elections were held the Democrats won out in fifty of the larger cities. In twenty-two the Republicans obtained a majority or plurality, while Progressives were elected in five cases. Citizens tickets carried in twelve contests and at Mitchell a Labor party candidate was chosen. The Progressive victories occurred at Elkhart, Marion, North Vernon, Richmond and Seymour.¹³

The Indianapolis vote stood Bell 19,879, Bookwalter 14,332, Johnson 14,238, Lehnert (Socialist) 3,266, Burkhardt (Socialist Labor) 288, Stanley (Prohibitionist) 336, Woods 2,026. Bookwalter's margin over Johnson was only 94 and Bell's plurality 5,547. Mr. Bookwalter after learning of the result said: "I believe Indianapolis is still a Republican city and that Republican nominees will be successful when the people

¹² Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 1, 1913.

¹³ Mayors elected in Indiana, Indianapolis *Star*, Nov. 6, 1913.

Democrats—Anderson, Angola, Auburn, Bedford, Bloomington, Bluffton, Boonville, Columbus, Connersville, Covington, Crawfordsville, Crown Point, Decatur, Delphi, Elwood, Evansville, Franklin, Fort Wayne, Gas City, Greencastle, Greensburg, Greenfield, Goshen, Hammond, Hartford City, Huntington, Huntingburg, Jeffersonville, Kendallville, Kokomo, Lebanon, Linton, Logansport, Martinsville, Mt. Vernon, Muncie, Portland, Plymouth, Princeton, Shelbyville, Sullivan, Tell City, Terre Haute, Tipton, Union City, Veedersburg, Wabash, Washington, Indianapolis. Republicans—Attica, Batesville, Brazil, Cannelton, Columbia City, Frankfort, Laporte, Lawrenceburg, Ligonier, Loogootee, Madison, Monticello, New Albany, Noblesville, Rensselaer, Rising Sun, Rochester, Rushville, Vincennes, Winchester, Warsaw, Whiting. Citizens—Butler, Garrett, Gary, Jasonville, Lafayette, Michigan City, Mishawaka, Rockport, South Bend, Valparaiso, New Castle, Peru. Progressives—Elkhart, Marion, North Vernon, Richmond, Seymour. Peoples—Monteplier. Labor—Mitchell.

forget their nonsense." His defeat was due, perhaps, to the presence of the Progressive ticket in the contest but the latter might have explained his failure in the same way. It was simply another illustration of the fact that here in Indiana a divided opposition stood little chance of defeating a united Democracy.

Progressive leaders declared that no comfort was to be found in the assumption that the new party was losing ground. They maintained that even though the conditions of 1912 were missing, wherever a test of strength was made the Progressive party had shown a body of men fighting for principles and demanding that there should be one party representative of those principles. The municipal elections shorn of extraordinary feeling and rapidly shifting of balances, which marked the 1912 contest, showed the Progressives as still a potent group with at least some aligned in their ranks who stood for no compromise short of a complete acceptance of their faith.

Joseph B. Kealing endeavored to show that the Progressives had weakened while the Republicans gained. Taking the vote of thirty-three cities he pointed out that the Democrats lost 8,500 votes, the Progressives lost 11,000 while the Republicans gained 15,000. It required another election to definitely determine the future success of the new party.

Indiana Progressives held a rally at Indianapolis on November 25, 1913. Delegations were present from Anderson, Crawfordsville, Noblesville and Richmond. The program included a luncheon at noon in the Hume-Mansur building, a public meeting at one o'clock addressed by Raymond Robins of Chicago, a state conference at three o'clock for workers, to be held in the Claypool hotel, at five o'clock a public meeting in the Hume building with Mrs. Annette Funk of Chicago and Fred Landis speakers. In the evening there was a large meeting addressed by Senator Moses E. Clapp of Minnesota, Everett Colby of New Jersey, John J. McCutcheon of Chicago and Raymond Robins of Chicago.

Firm loyalty was the keynote of the gathering. Those present pledged themselves to stand by the ideals of 1912 and declared any compromise with the Republican party to be impossible. Though the immediate cause of the formation of

the new party was the dishonesty and fraud practiced by the Republican national convention, it was in reality the culmination of movements that had long been in progress. Various groups working independently along different lines for the general betterment saw in the new party the opportunity that had not been offered by either of the old political organizations. A large number of people, interested in one phase or another of social industrial or political reform, that received no encouragement from the old parties, or else had been espoused only to be betrayed, saw in the Progressive party a chance to promote their respective causes and came together under its banner. The movement crystallized under the "insurgents" in congress like Beveridge, Poindexter and Murdock. The new party offered all dissatisfied persons an opportunity and they welcomed it.

The new organization was now undergoing a test to see whether it could long endure. Those of the more earnest adherents contended that their platform stood for something. That unlike that of the Democratic party, it was a program. The principles they adopted were vital, they looked to a changing of the social, industrial and political order, they represented the needs of the people and because they did there was no disposition to abandon them and return to the Republican or Democratic fold. Some Progressives contended that there was even less prospect than ever before of accomplishing anything through those parties.

As with every new political movement deserters were expected. Certain men attached themselves to it for selfish reasons and with little or no interest in its principles. They either wished revenge on opponents or hoped for the rewards of success, the spoils of office, or personal prominence not before obtainable. Such men would soon drop out and in fact some had already done so.

Those who remained faithful claimed that they were not working for power because it would give them control of a few offices. They were rather working for principles because they believed that the interests of the people demanded the inauguration of those principles. If in the meantime Democrats or Republicans should take up and put in operation any of the Progressive reforms, members of the Progressive party

would rejoice over the spread of their beliefs. But they would not join the Republicans because they had ceased to be in touch with the people and had shown no signs of abandoning their allegiance to the interests. Neither would the true Progressives join the Democrats because they were mere office seekers, were apt to Bryanize the currency and had so far rendered mere lip service to genuine reform. Thus did the loyal Progressives feel about their position even in the face of almost certain defeat. They had "a cause to fight for" and their "heart was in the fight."¹⁴

The Tenth district Progressives were first to lead off with an organization rally following the state gathering. The national committee planned to encourage and promote a campaign in all the states for the election of Progressive congressmen and for county tickets in each county. At Lafayette, therefore, arrangements were made for the selection at an early date of precinct committeemen, county chairmen and for the beginning of activities in the general interests of the party. The delegates indorsed the new primary election law and called for elections under it.

Enthusiasm ran high when a few of the Progressive leaders gathered at Indianapolis for a conference, December 23. Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Toner and others received ovations as they renewed pledges of undying loyalty to the fight for the people. The former senator reiterated his advice made by letter to the Illinois Progressive conference on December 16. In substance he urged "No amalgamation, no combination, no relations of any kind with any other party whatsoever." E. C. Toner also maintained that it was the duty of the Progressive party to proceed alone without the aid of or fusion with any other party.¹⁵

The Progressives began to perfect their party organization early in the year 1914. On January 13 occurred the election

¹⁴ Indianapolis *Star*, Nov. 27, 1913.

¹⁵ Indianapolis *Star*, Dec. 24, 1913. "I see," said Mr. Toner, "that some of the Republicans in Marion county suggest a eugenic marriage of the Republican and Progressive parties. A few days ago Bud Coler, controller of the City of New York, said that if the present practice of eugenics were realized the race would be extinct within 150 years. I can say, however, that a marriage of the Republican and Progressive parties would in no wise conform to even eugenic principles, but if this might be in error and if such a marriage might occur, the result would be in no wise related to success at the polls for the next forty years."

of precinct committeemen who in turn chose county chairmen on January 17 and new district chairmen on January 20. For chairman of the state committee the names of John M. Johnson of Logansport and Edward C. Toner of Anderson were mentioned. Some urged Chairman E. M. Lee to continue to serve and he was finally chosen on February 14.

Reports from four district meetings throughout the state indicated the existence of a spirit of organization and much zeal. Every Progressive was urged to put himself in touch with his party leaders at once, attend meetings, inducing others to do the same, help form clubs, to arrange meetings in his own neighborhood or precinct. Women were also urged to help in the work even though they were not voters. All who desired the ballot and Progressive social reforms were asked to support the Progressive party as the only one that offered them what they wanted.¹⁶

A banquet was arranged by the management of the Progressive club for February 14 at the Hume-Mansur building in Indianapolis. Party leaders held a conference in the afternoon. John M. Parker of New Orleans was present to deliver an address. District chairmen present at the conference were: 1. E. S. Crumbaker, Evansville; 2. Dr. Renos Richard, Patricksburg; 4. Will H. Newsom, Elizabethtown; 5. Lewis B. McNutt, Brazil; 6. H. T. Roberts, Greenfield; 7. Harry Chamberlin, Indianapolis; 8. L. Ray Lenich, Union City; 9. William H. Dye, Noblesville; 10. G. R. Coffin, Monticello; 11. Neil W. McGrevey, Wabash; 12. Harry R. Brown, Waterloo.

It was announced that about all the counties would put out tickets in 1914 which would be much better than in 1912. Reports at the meeting carried the idea that many Republicans were not taking much consolation in their new state committee. The trouble being that new district chairmen elected on February 10 were aligned with the standpat element and that little could be hoped in the way of progressiveism from them. This dissatisfaction manifested itself in the Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth and Thirteenth districts.¹⁷ Chances of Progressive success were thus given an early boost.

¹⁶ Indianapolis *Star*, Feb. 10, 1914.

¹⁷ Indianapolis *Star*, Feb. 16, 1914.

E. C. Toner of Anderson, who had been chosen chairman of the state executive committee, proceeded at once to build up an efficient working of various units throughout the state.

The Democratic party again showed its partiality for an early nominating convention by setting the date for its state meeting on March 19. The party was filled with such enthusiasm and hope as come from supremacy. There was an abundance of candidates for all offices. Competition and disappointment were expected to cause animosities in some cases. The long campaign however would give opportunity to adjust these difficulties.

Governor Ralston was chosen as temporary chairman to deliver the keynote. He, himself, did not care for the honor, and favored a senator who would discuss national issues. The prevailing majority however declared that state issues would be paramount to everything else.

A feature of the convention was the adoption of a platform containing a recommendation for a primary election law in Indiana. Senator Kern forced the issue by announcing the desire of President Wilson and Mr. Bryan for such a plank. Many of the party followers declared that the President was bent upon progressivizing the Democratic party in Indiana. At any rate he was able to obtain a favorable consideration of this reform.¹⁸

The ticket nominated by the convention was headed by Benjamin F. Shively of South Bend for reelection as United States senator. Homer L. Cook of Indianapolis was named for secretary of state; Dale J. Crittenberger, Anderson for auditor; George A. Bittler, Fort Wayne, for treasurer; Richard M. Milburn, Jasper, for attorney general; J. Fred France, Huntington, for clerk of supreme and appellate courts; Charles A. Greathouse, Indianapolis, for state superintendent of public instruction; Moses B. Lairy, Logansport, for judge of the supreme court for the Fifth district; judges of appellate court First district, Milton B. Hottel, Salem, and Edward W. Felt, Greenfield; judges of supreme court Second district, Frank M. Powers, Angola, Joseph G. Ibach, Hammond, and Fred S. Caldwell, Winchester.¹⁹

¹⁸ Indianapolis News, March 19, 1914.

¹⁹ Indianapolis News, March 20, 1914.

The Progressives at first planned to hold their state nominating convention on May 1. Objection was made to this date on account of busy season in the rural districts. The date was therefore changed to April 16 one week before the Republican meeting, but because Tomlinson hall was not available for that date another and final change was made to April 18 and 19. There were 1669 delegates elected on April 10, on the basis of one for each hundred votes for Beveridge in 1912. These met at the statehouse by districts to select members for the credentials, resolutions, rules and order committees.

The convention was looked forward to with more than ordinary interest because it represented the more settled and determined thought and intentions of the new party, to a degree not possible in the excitement and enthusiasm of its formation. Its members had had almost two years in which to reflect on the movement, to compare its principles with the promises and acts of the old organizations, and to measure the importance of their undertaking. Their zeal was unbroken. Their convention was firm. There was much work to be done. They had rejected all overtures to return to their former allegiance. The "grand old party" had shown no signs meet for repentance. The Democrats had paid them a tribute by adopting, though reluctantly, some of their reform ideas, e. g., the direct primary plank.²⁰

Due to the presence of senators Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota, Miles Poindexter of Washington, Charles Sumner Bird of Massachusetts in addition to Mr. Beveridge and Mr. Landis of Indiana, the Progressive message was delivered with all the graces of oratory and depth of conviction.

Mr. Bird warned his hearers against amalgamation, if the Progressives wished to be faithful to themselves or to have their influence felt and to see the ideals of their platform put into operation.

It would mean compromise, and any wing of the Progressive party that compromises deserves nothing but the fate in store for it—death. If they amalgamate they are lost. They must keep on fighting not so much for offices as for good government and they attain enough com-

²⁰ *Indianapolis Star*, April 17, 1914.

pensation when they force the adoption of the things they are fighting for.²¹

The Minnesota senator declared that the Progressive party was never so strong as at that time.

No man can be elected in 1916 unless he can make the people believe that he is in sympathy with what are known as the "Roosevelt policies." All through this land there are thousands and millions of men in the twilight zone of doubt and uncertainty, thoroughly disgusted with the old political machine. The Republican party probably would have passed into history had it not been for the temporary revival under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt.²²

In their platform the Progressives reaffirmed the basic principles of the 1912 document. It declared for woman suffrage, minimum wage, workmen's compensation, public utilities, regulation by commission, and free school books. The foreign policy of Wilson's administration was condemned especially so far as it related to Mexico, Panama Canal tolls, and the Columbian claim. Prohibition was a knotty question as in 1912. From the northern part of the state there came a more insistent demand for it than from the southern part. Delegates from the Eighth, Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh districts were particularly active in favor of the Prohibition plank. The 1912 plank was favored by delegates from the southern part and a large number of those from the Sixth district. It seemed inconsistent to most of the delegates to favor woman suffrage and not prohibition.²³

The demand for Albert J. Beveridge as senatorial candidate was so great as to almost force him to accept the nomination. When Fred Landis placed his name before the convention an enthusiastic demonstration followed. The former senator then accepted the honor by merely saying "alright".²⁴

William A. Pierson received the nomination for secretary of state; George W. Lott for auditor; John Bower for treasurer; Arthur G. Manning for attorney general; Edward R. Lewis for clerk of the supreme court; John W. Kendall for superintendent of public instruction; Jethro C. Culmer for

²¹ Indianapolis *Star*, April 18, 1914.

²² Indianapolis *Star*, April 18, 1914.

²³ Indianapolis *Star*, April 19, 1914.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

state geologist; Lou W. Vail for judge of the supreme court, Fifth district; Henry P. Pearson and Elias D. Salsbury for judges of the appellate court, First district; George H. Koons, Willis E. Roe and Homer C. Underwood for judges of the appellate court, Second district. Edward C. Toner was made state chairman while Edwin M. Lee and Alva L. Kitselman were selected to serve as the two state committeemen at large.²⁵

The Republican state convention met on April 22 and 23 at Indianapolis. Delegates and visitors attending lacked the old air of confidence which usually permeated conventions of the party in former years. Instead they showed signs of a disposition to put themselves in line with what they regarded as the safest of the newer political ideas. Some attention was being given by them to woman suffrage, state-wide primaries and a minimum wage law for women. Progressives watched the proceedings with interest. They wished to consider their Republican friends as good citizens and good fellows but only misguided.

Hugh Th. Miller received the senatorial nomination. Edward Jackson was named for secretary of state, Harry R. Campbell for state geologist, I. Newt Brown for auditor, Job Freeman for treasurer, Ele Stansbury for attorney general, Horace Ellis for state superintendent, Will H. Adams for clerk of the supreme and appellate courts, Quincy A. Myers for judge of the supreme court, Fifth district, Ira C. Batman and Lucius C. Embree for judges of the appellate court, First district; Marcellus A. Chipman, Shepard J. Crumpacker and Ulysses A. Lesh for judges of the appellate court, Second district.²⁶

Progressive workers declared the prospects of success for their cause were much more auspicious than they were in 1912 when they outran the Republicans. When members of the latter party tried to show that because of losses sustained in standpat eastern congressional districts the new party was fading away the Progressives urged that nothing in Indiana showed such indications. The half-hearted stand of the Republicans for woman suffrage, for a constitutional conven-

²⁵ Indianapolis *Star*, April 19, 1914.

²⁶ Indianapolis *News*, April 24, 1914.

tion, for the formation of a new constitution, and for Prohibition, would not deceive the people. Again the Democratic refusal to stand for the constitutional convention and woman suffrage set forth the position of that party clearly.

The Progressives therefore felt that they had the best platform and ticket. All parties were planning to get an early start. The new party was not going to be asleep, but hastened to lay its campaign lines in all counties. By means of a series of district conferences they planned a more complete organization. Mr. Beveridge and Mr. Toner were both active in promoting these conferences and attended as many as they could. With a thorough organization the Progressives had hopes of successfully competing against the Democrats and Republicans, especially in those districts where either of their opponents were divided or in poor standing with the people.²⁷

Owing to the fact that this was not a presidential election year the chief interest centered around the congressional and senatorial contests. The Progressives claimed exceptional strength in the Second, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Tenth, Eleventh, and Thirteenth districts.

The First district developed a hot race between S. Wallace Cook, the Republican nominee, Ulrich H. Seiler the Progressive candidate and Representative Charles W. Lieb who had been renominated by the Democrats. This district was not considered a Progressive stronghold. The basis of hope was due to a Lieb and anti-Lieb faction among the Democrats. The trouble arose from some post-office appointments which displeased a few party followers.

Representative William A. Cullop, a Democrat, was opposed in the second district by Oscar E. Bland, Republican, and James B. Wilson, Progressive. Here the Democrats were again divided into a Cullop and an anti-Cullop faction. Some leading party workers who were ambitious for official honors thought Cullop had represented the district long enough and that it would be best for him to step down in favor of some other candidate.

The Third and Fourth districts were both conceded to the Democrats almost without a struggle. Representative Wil-

²⁷ *Indianapolis Star*, April 26, 1914.

liam E. Cox and Lincoln Dixon respectively had such following that it was a hopeless task to oppose them.

Both Progressives and Republicans had hope in the Fifth district. Representative Moss, the Democratic candidate, had as his opponents R. L. Shattuck, Republican, and Otis E. Gulley, Progressive of Danville. The result largely depended upon the vote of Vigo county. Here there were many charges marked up against the two old parties, especially the Democratic, on account of election frauds. If Mr. Moss could claim a normal vote there he might be elected. Road roller tactics used in the party's district convention caused several of its members to become disgusted with it. Progressives felt that the miners approved the new party's stand on the tariff in preference to that of the Democrats. The Democratic tariff was also blamed for lack of employment at the mines. A convention of the workers had denounced it. Mr. Moss' opposition to woman suffrage was also expected to go hard with him.

The Progressives of the Sixth district held their convention at Cambridge City, January 20, as directed by R. G. Leeds, the district chairman. Prof. Elbert Russell of Earlham college was nominated for congress. Patrick J. Lynch of New Castle was the Republican candidate though many of the party workers expected D. W. Comstock of Richmond to get the honor. Some of the leaders were offended therefore because James E. Watson backed Mr. Lynch. It was the same old contest between Rush and Wayne counties. Knightstown and Shelbyville papers opposed Lynch.²⁸ Mr. Russell was a good speaker and it was thought that he would make a splendid showing against Representative Finley Gray and Lynch.

The Seventh district presented an interesting contest between Representative Charles Korbly, Democrat; Merrill Moores, Republican and Paxton Hibben, Progressive. The Republicans had chosen J. W. Fesler as their district chairman. While Frank A. Doudican, a young Indianapolis attorney, managed the Progressive party. The Republicans early in February formed a "get together committee" with

²⁸ Indianapolis *Star*, June 17, 1914.

the idea of bringing back to their organization those who had gone astray two years before.²⁹ John C. Rucklehaus advocated so progressive and radical a platform that the most ardent Bull Mooser could support it also the rotation of candidates in office until one-half were Republican and the others Progressive. Clarence R. Martin of Lawrence, who was chosen for Marion county chairman, scouted the idea of "getting together" and rather planned more vigorous work than ever. He declared that the Republicans offered no home to return to. The action of the Marion county organization was important to the welfare of the Progressive party in the state.

We are the keystone of a state, which has been for years the central point of contest in American politics. The eyes of the Progressives all over the country are on us and we must by our acts and our showing this fall demonstrate to them the strength of the party in the hottest fighting ground in the nation. When we founded this party in 1912 we entered upon a new and enlightened era in politics to prove that this is a government for the people, by the people and not for the bosses, by the bosses. The Progressives conducted two honest campaigns and showed that it could be done.³⁰

Mr. Hibben, Progressive nominee at the head of the district ticket, was a writer and diplomat as well as a politician. He pledged faithful service and to act always in the interests of the public. He argued for the protective tariff because every nation in the world had one except England and she could not produce her own supplies. His speech of acceptance of the congressional nomination together with a concise outline of Progressive principles made up a political campaign pamphlet which he distributed throughout the district.

Progressives looked upon the Eighth district as a stronghold of their party. Harry L. Kitselman of Muncie was nominated for congress over Oswald Ryan of Anderson. John A. M. Adair of Portland was renominated by the Democrats and Albert H. Vestal by the Republicans. New party men expected gains from the Democratic ranks in Adams county where the growers of sugar beets were dissatisfied with the effect of the Democratic tariff on their industry.³¹

²⁹ *Indianapolis News*, Feb. 7 and 8, 1914.

³⁰ *Indianapolis Star*, March 16, 1914.

³¹ *Indianapolis Star*, Aug. 8, 1914.

In the Ninth district the Progressives felt that they had a fighting chance. Charles A. Ford, a Kokomo manufacturer, was nominated as their congressional candidate at Lebanon, April 8. W. A. Moon of Crawfordsville was the only other candidate presented to the convention but he withdrew. The platform adopted favored the passage of a joint resolution then before congress providing for a constitutional amendment prohibiting traffic in intoxicating liquors, also advocated a state law prohibiting the shipment of liquor into dry territory. Until the adoption of a nation wide prohibition law they favored the adoption of state-wide prohibition by an amendment to the state constitution. They opposed amalgamation of any sort and reaffirmed faith in the principles set forth in the 1912 platform.

The Tenth district, normally Republican by a good margin, had been lost to the Democrats in the 1912 struggle. Will R. Wood was nominated by the Republicans for congress, and Will H. Ade by the Progressives. Representative J. B. Peterson was renominated by the Democrats. Mr. Wood had been a state senator for a continuous term of sixteen years. In this office his career had been very active, having made more speeches and introduced more bills than any other man in the General Assembly.³² Will H. Ade, the Progressive nominee, was a farmer and banker. They felt that he would make a strong appeal among the farmers. The importation of Argentine corn into this country displeased them very much.

B. B. Shively of Marion had a lively race as the Progressive nominee for Congress from the Eleventh district. His opponents were Representative George W. Rauch, Democrat, and S. L. Strickler, Republican. Mr. Rauch had lost some support, notably in Grant county, through making too large a number of postoffice appointments, at least this served as argument against him there. Shively as a former Democrat was expected to draw largely from his former party. In a meeting at East Chicago on the night of August 4 he told why he was a Progressive. The new party represented the Jeffersonian ideals of the Democratic party and

³² Indianapolis *Star*, March 5, 1914.

coupled to these, new ideals which embodied the best thought along the lines of economic and political welfare.

Representative Cyrus Cline, Democrat, was renominated for congress in the Twelfth district. The Progressive opposition was not enough to materially affect the result. Their nominee, Jacob G. Wise, was unable to command a thousand votes, and received the smallest poll of any Progressive congressional candidate.

Harry A. Barnhart was renominated by the Democrats in the Thirteenth district. He had a strong following, and there were some indications of a fusion ticket in order to defeat him. Charles A. Carlisle of South Bend expressed a desire to run for both Republicans and Progressives. This, however, was not done.³⁴

For the first time, Indiana voters would vote directly for United States senator under the seventeenth amendment. Former Senator Albert J. Beveridge, as the Progressive candidate, made a strenuous campaign. His first important address was at Terre Haute, September 14. Here he emphasized the superiority of the Progressive party's business program. His candidacy was given wide publicity in some of the leading magazines. *Colliers Weekly* credited him as being the strongest candidate in the Indiana race.³⁵ Neither of the opposition candidates, Hugh Th. Miller, Republican, nor Senator B. F. Shively, Democrat, was an active campaigner, like Mr. Beveridge. Now that the people could vote directly they were expected to reflect the popularity of their former spokesman. During the fourth week of his campaign the Progressive nominee was scheduled to visit four districts. His was the most thorough campaign of the highways and byways ever attempted by any former contestant for senatorial honors in Indiana.³⁶

The variety of subjects discussed and audiences addressed, is shown by the fact that on October 4, in the midst of his campaign, he kept an appointment to speak in Evansville to the business men on "Success and How to Achieve It." In the evening of the same day he gave another address on "The

³⁴ Indianapolis *Star*, Aug. 5, 1914.

³⁵ *Colliers*, Sept. 1914.

³⁶ Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 5, 1914.

Bible as Literature," at the Simpson M. E. church in that city. Some idea of the number of speeches made by Mr. Beveridge may be gained from a glance at his schedule for the week of October 12. Speeches were to be made at Pendleton, Anderson, Alexandria, Elwood, Hobbs, Windfall, Rigdon, Fairmount, Converse, Marion, Soldiers Home, Gas City, Upland, Hartford City, Warren, Huntington, Andrews, Wabash, North Manchester, South Whitley, Columbia City, Pierceton, Warsaw, Milford, Syracuse, Cromwell, Albion, Ligonier, Decatur, Bluffton, and Fort Wayne. Besides these there was always the possibility of his being waylaid at most any village because of a demand for a short talk to the populace.

Shively's record was assailed, Mr. Beveridge accusing him of leading in no important legislation and of voting as the caucus told him to vote. As a narrow partisan and spoilsman he was represented as wanting to get back to Washington by default.

At Indianapolis on October 23, the former senator attacked Senator Borah who was touring the state in the interests of the Republicans. Borah had accused Mr. Beveridge of saying in one of his addresses, that the Progressive was a "white man's party." This assertion the latter declared was not true and violated the corrupt practices act. His campaign was closed in Marion county on October 31.

Mr. Shively remained in Washington until very late in the campaign. On October 24 he began a brief campaign at Shelbyville. He made speeches in only a few of the larger cities and chiefly in the northern part of the state. At the same time Vice-President Marshall and Governor Ralston made some addresses in behalf of the national administration. Mr. Shively urged the indorsement and reinstatement of the Democratic administration in order that it might complete the reforms that had been started.

The Republicans closed their campaign in Indianapolis on October 30 with United States Senator William Alden Smith as the speaker. The Progressives were invited to return. The immediate cause of their defection was now two

years removed so that they might be expected to gradually come back.

A "flying squadron" of former Democrats was organized to stump the state for the Progressives. Among its members were William A. Pierson of New Albany candidate for secretary of state, Clarence Weidler of South Bend, Democratic representative in the 1913 General Assembly, Earl Crawford of Milton, John W. Kitch of South Bend, Oswald Ryan of Anderson, and B. B. Shively of Marion.

In and around Indianapolis the Progressives had several good speakers, some having had experience in the 1912 contest. Among these were William D. Headrick, Willitts A. Bastian, Paxton Hibben, William G. White, John H. Kingsbury, J. V. Zartman and Thomas A. Daily. Outside of Marion county prominent exponents of progressiveism were Frederick Landis, John T. Hume, Edward R. Lewis, Clifford F. Jackman, Roscoe G. Fertich and the Rev. J. Van Nice Bandy of Fowler. On September 26 Mr. Roosevelt dropped into Indianapolis for an address. He endeavored to assist all candidates by urging voters to continue the forward movement in the state.

In November, 1912, St. Joseph county Progressives planned a party newspaper organ at Mishawaka. The movement for a new constitution called for the establishment in 1914 of a monthly magazine, *The Citizen*, ten numbers of which were published. Contributing editors included Mr. Beveridge, Dr. Paul L. Haworth, Dr. Amelia R. Keller, W. D. Foulke, Lucius B. Swift, W. K. Stewart, George L. Dewey and others.

On April 17 the Progressive Press association of the state held a meeting at the party club rooms in Indianapolis, R. B. Inman, president, said his list showed about one hundred Progressive newspapers in the state. The list included besides weeklies the following dailies:

The Indianapolis *Star*, Anderson *Herald*, Madison *Democrat*, Muncie *Star*, Bloomington *Journal*, Goshen *News-Times*, Terre Haute *Star*, Richmond *Palladium*, Lafayette *Courier*, Connersville *News*, Brazil *Times*, Vincennes *Capitol*, Bedford *Progressive* and the Mitchell *Tribune*. Later others were added to the list. The Elkhart *Review* for a long time Re-

publican turned Progressive. The Princeton *Independent*, New Castle *Progressive Herald*, and the Liberty *Herald* were also counted as back of the new party. Besides these there were other favorable publications at Macy, Kokomo and Huntington. With these publications to supplement the well directed stump campaign, the Progressive cause was presented to the people in no uncertain terms. Although the new party could entertain no assurance of victory it was determined to make a good showing at the polls. Just how well it succeeded in this is at once evident from its future history.

The press and politicians talked fusion throughout the year. The Progressives, however, declared that any party good enough to fuse with was good enough to vote with. This seemed to be the real situation, for, having returned in 1914, many former Progressives remained loyal at the polls to their old party which they had forsaken two years before.

In Bango township, Elkhart county, the Republicans and Progressives merged in the election of a township ticket. They adopted the name of "citizens" and chose clasped hands as an emblem.³⁷ Progressives accused the Republicans in Putnam and other counties of deliberately nominating some men from their party on the Republican ticket in order to make it appear that they were coming back. Only the vote could determine the real extent of repentance among the new party men.

Senator Shively was re-elected by a plurality of 45,483 over Mr. Miller. The vote for Mr. Beveridge was 108,581, or less than half of that for the Republican nominee. Evidently many who supported him in 1912, were now voting another ticket. Two of the congressional seats were reclaimed by the Republicans. These were the Seventh and Tenth. In neither of the districts did the Progressive nominees win second place. Their vote was considerably less than the party received in 1912. In only two districts, the Sixth and Eighth, did the Progressive vote amount to as much as half of the Republican figures. The poorest showing made

³⁷ Indianapolis *Star*, Aug. 2, 1914.

by them was in the Twelfth congressional race, where the candidate, Jacob G. Wise, received only 789 votes.³⁸

The Democrats still controlled both branches of the General Assembly, but with a greatly reduced majority in the house of representatives. The proposal to have a constitutional convention was voted down by 103,807 and that for a centennial memorial building met a similar fate by 368,982. Successful nominees asserted that the result showed an approach to more independent voting and the fading of party lines. While this was no doubt a cause yet there is an indication of a conservative reaction. This is perhaps more evident in other states where questions like woman suffrage and prohibition were up for more or less definite solution. The people were trying to play safe and be conservative. In North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Nevada woman suffrage was defeated, not on merit perhaps, but yet defeated.

Immediately after the returns were in, November 5, the Progressive state committee in a meeting at the Hotel English adopted a resolution stating the party's plans for the immediate future:

The Progressive party was organized by sincere men and women who wanted to make this country better and our people happier. That movement must and will go forward. We are right on every fundamental question. Temporary defeat nerves us to greater efforts. We pledge the thousands of voters who have stood with us that we will continue the fight until victory is won. Tuesday's election returned to power the most extreme reactionaries in the country. Men whose names only yesterday were synonymous for all that is bad in American politics are more strongly enthroned than ever before. Two years ago there was a swing to impracticable and incompetent Democracy; today there is a swing to the most backward looking Republicanism; tomorrow the swing will be to us. We begin right now for the battle of 1916.

Signed Willitts A. Bastian, Howard T. Roberts, Harry T. Kitselman Dr. R. H. Richards and Rudolph G. Leeds.³⁹

All the parties looked forward to a real test in 1916. The Republicans were inspired by their recent gains to do all in their power to regain control. Their headquarters were

³⁸ *Report of Secretary of State, 1914*, pp. 170-173.

³⁹ *Indianapolis Star*, Nov. 6, 1914.

to remain open and publicity plans would be kept up along with their optimism. Indiana was due for plenty of politics for the next two years.

The same Republican ticket was expected to be in the field again. James P. Goodrich was mentioned as the candidate for governor. As national committeeman he was looked upon as a man trying to bring about party harmony. At a meeting of the state committee on November 14 it was decided to have a "get together" love feast during the Christmas holiday season. The committee resolved to give each Republican an equal voice in the management of the party.⁴⁰

About two hundred Progressives gathered at the party club rooms in the Hume-Mansur building on November 15 when they determined to continue the fight for progressive principles. Those present were asked to sign cards pledging aid in keeping up the movement through the campaign of 1916. Some leading members of the party in 1912 had already deserted it. Their attitude seemed to be that they regarded continuance in the new party as an ineffectual effort to accomplish anything in practical politics.

Chief among the early deserters were Taylor Groninger of Indianapolis and Horace Stilwell of Anderson. According to the latter a new progressive lineup had occurred within the Republican party and it had become the real progressive party in America. Former differences within the Republican party were differences of means rather than of ends. The Progressive party could no longer be used as an instrument to accomplish progressive results. He felt that it would be wiser to abandon the Progressive party as a party and to preserve the movement as a movement.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Indianapolis *Star*, Nov. 15, 1914. "Recognizing that party management and control should at all times be responsive to and representative of the sentiment and will of the party and believing that an indifferent attitude toward this principle has been responsible for party dissensions in the past, we pledge ourselves to such reforms in the methods of party organization, management and control, that in the future the rights of the individual participation on the part of members within the party shall be sacred and inviolate and we further pledge ourselves that party programs, party platforms and party candidates shall be expressive only of the majority sentiment within the party, free from the dictation or duress of the party management." It was agreed that the Progressives should be asked to come back.

⁴¹ Indianapolis *Star*, Nov. 28, 1914. Stilwell letter: "I believe the Progressive party has become through natural processes of disintegration merely a place to pigeonhole purely academic opinions without any real vitality as a

The Progressive national committee, meeting at Chicago December 1 and 2, decided to continue for another year when a final decision as to its future would be reached. A Johnson boom for President was started by R. G. Leeds, the Indiana member.

"Progressive principles are permanent and it is now more than ever evident that the Progressive party today is the necessary organ for their realization."

A new kind of aggressiveness would prevail, different from that of 1912. There would be no hopeful, catchy phrases, no grandiloquence about "enlisting for the war," no bitterness, but quiet mature deliberation. The party was to sit tight, hold its national strength, organization, say nothing and saw wood, until the next arrangement of forces gave it its new opportunity to serve the principles to which it was dedicated. The Republicans could not think that "the cruel

positive political party, contributing only negative results, not positive progressive victories, protecting Democracy from punishment that is its due, professing faith in majority government but at the same time making minority government secure. I favor a two-party system where majority rules. Blocking the channel does not appeal to me. I am not leaving the Progressives but joining them. More than 300,000 affiliated with the Republicans on November 3 and hordes have joined since then. This is more than three times as many as remained with the Progressives. The new battle line—a tribute to American citizenship, which forced to solve pressing present economical problems by disciplining an incompetent Democracy—moved the entire Progressive army, with the exception of a few panting stragglers to the new position within the Republican party, where they can continue their progressive fight without interruption and at the same time administer to Democracy the punishment that it deserves. The first skirmish will be upon methods of party procedure and management. The party organization be a mere referee of contests within the party. We have had the progressive movement a long time before the Progressive party and we shall have it a long time afterward. While they obsequiously the while lament the untimely death of the virtuous party, the courage and energy continues undaunted upon its way. Pouters fail to grasp the meaning of the sweeping vote of November 3. The Progressives themselves have decided that their future activities shall continue within the Republican party; that the Progressive party is not necessary for Progressive success, and should be abandoned as a real interference and stumbling block in the way of the movement. That the movement will sweep along without the party and without the individuals that cling to the shell of the party name: that their misdirected sincerity will not save these excellent gentlemen from being politically pigeon-holed and effectually anchored in the dead eddy of a dormant party while the movement sweeps past them upon the irresistible tide of victory. They cannot keep up the fight pouting behind the abandoned breastworks of last year's battle fields. The fight will not be abandoned because the party movement failed. Ultimately it is my sincere hope that all real Progressives will feel the touch of each other's shoulders at the front upon the new line of battle within the Republican party."

war was over," 1,750,000 votes was a force to be reckoned with.

The party was to be a growing concern, with a determination to hold its place in the sun which it won by its own hard work. The national committee planned to meet again in December, 1915, when it would make plans for the 1916 convention and campaign. Convinced that the Republican party did not offer a fertile ground for their principles, some talked of indorsing Wilson, if a reactionary was nominated by it for President.⁴²

No one could be sure as to the outcome of the whole matter. In Indiana, as elsewhere, very much would depend upon the result of a conflict already staged between the old leadership of the Republican and the new. The new leaders seemed to be trying to keep its promises of a new deal in not only methods but men. If such a program were really undertaken it would be entitled to sympathy and aid, at any rate Progressives had already returned and were returning to their former alignment. Many no doubt reasoned like Stilwell and pictured themselves as members of a party which could never hope to do any positive piece of work. The outbreak of a world-wide war in Europe also tended to smother political divisions in this country so that with the handicap of the 1914 slump the Progressives could scarcely hope to survive.

THE CAMPAIGN OF 1916 AND THE END OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

Elections throughout the country in 1915 showed a further weakening of the Progressive party. This fact had its effect upon Indiana devotees of that faith who up until that time had refused to amalgamate with the Republicans. In November of that year elections occurred in eight states east of the Mississippi river. New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts were to have the equal suffrage issue up in addition to their other contests. In Massachusetts and Maryland, governors were to be elected, and in Ohio the question of state-wide prohibition was up for settlement. The Progress-

⁴² Indianapolis *Star*, Dec. 2, 1914.

sives polled 12,000 more votes than the Republicans in 1912 in Kentucky and the old party men were counting on swamping them this year. Other states having elections were Mississippi and New Jersey.¹

In the election the Republicans gained considerable strength electing a governor in Massachusetts and increasing their legislative majority in New Jersey. McCall's election in Massachusetts was due to the returned Progressive vote. The latter party polled less than three per cent of the total count or not enough to make it a legal party any longer. In Maryland the Progressive party disappeared altogether. In Kentucky where it had a ticket its showing was small, though if its votes had been given to the Republican candidate for governor he might have been elected. Woman suffrage failed to carry in each case. Ohio voted wet, Cleveland and Cincinnati giving Republican pluralities. In New York the new constitution question received a negative vote.

With a considerable number of the Progressives returned to their former allegiance in 1916, a hard fight was expected between the two major parties. Especially true would this be in the northern states carried by Mr. Wilson on account of the Roosevelt candidacy. With one or two exceptions these states had since gone Republican in state or congressional elections. Such states as New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan which went Democratic in the last presidential campaign were claimed now by Republican leaders. The principal exceptions were Indiana, Maine and California. According to national chairman Hilles all New England would go like Massachusetts. When it was understood that Governor Johnson would attend the next Republican convention this left little doubt about California. Indiana then stood alone as a doubtful state and would be the center of a desperate struggle. The two old parties would fight it out on comparatively equal terms in the Hoosier state. If there was any more reason for encouragement for the Republicans most persons would admit that it was largely due to the nomination of men not reactionaries and favorable to the Progressives. The party had a

¹ Indianapolis *News*, Nov. 1, 1915.

good start but only a good start. The only way for it to do was to meet the reasonable desires of those showing a disposition to return to it. In local elections throughout the state the Republicans made a fine showing. They made a concerted effort with a great result. Although in many cases the contests were non-partisan or citizen affairs, yet it is doubtful if ever so much party spirit had been displayed in the state within recent years. Conspicuous examples of this were to be found at Corydon and West Terre Haute, normally Democratic centers, but where the Republicans won after hard fought contests.² In 1916 they wanted a heavy plurality.

The year 1916 was another presidential year. In Indiana a governor would be elected as well as one United States senator. These contests insured a lively campaign in the Hoosier commonwealth. Democratic candidates for the governorship were John A. M. Adair of Portland, Fred F. Bayes of Sullivan, J. W. Harrison of Attica, John W. Boehne of Evansville, J. Kirby Risk of Kokomo, and Leonard B. Clore of Laporte county. Republicans desiring to lead their party's ticket were James P. Goodrich of Winchester, Quincy A. Myers of Logansport and Warren T. McCray of Kentland. The Progressives were at a loss to know whom they should indorse for the race. Former governor J. Frank Hanley let it be known that he would make the race, as a Progressive, with the understanding that the party declared for prohibition and did not demand the application of the initiative, referendum or recall. His name had been filed as a candidate for governor by the Progressive state committee, because names of candidates for state offices had to be filed with the secretary of state on or before January 7 and all others had declined to allow their names to be used.³ The senatorial race attracted attention from the very beginning. John W. Kern was the Democratic candidate for re-election. Harry S. New, James E. Watson, and Arthur R. Robinson were out for the Republican nomination. Judge James B. Wilson of Bloomington and William D. Foulke of Richmond were prominently mentioned as Progressive aspirants. Mr. Foulke, however, withdrew because he

² *Indianapolis News*, Nov. 6, 1915.

³ This was in accordance with the new primary election law passed by the 1915 General Assembly of Indiana.

could not agree to eliminate from the Progressive state platform the declaration for the initiative, referendum and recall, upon which J. Frank Hanly made conditional his acceptance of the nomination for governor on the Progressive ticket.⁴ This left Judge Wilson's name to appear on the ticket for the senatorial nomination.

Indiana led the way of primary states this year under her new primary election law. Republican, Democratic and Progressive parties all nominated candidates for governor, United States senator, representatives in congress and county officials, all voting at the same time and place in each precinct. The Republicans held out the glad hand to the Progressives, inviting the latter to join them in the nomination of their candidates. The supreme court had ruled, January 5, that the law would not prevent such participation, and that a party could decide for itself as to the voter's good faith in each case.⁵ The question arose in connection with a proposed fusion of Republicans and Progressives in some of the northern counties. E. D. Salsbury, vice-chairman of the Progressives, said the criminal section of the law made such fusion impossible, since section 28 provided a fine for voting another ticket than that for which a man voted for a majority of its candidates at the last general election. The court's ruling, however, removed this difficulty, and the Republicans made a spirited effort to get out a heavy vote so that the Progressives would be shown up.⁶

A dominant feature of the vote on March 7 was the strong Republican showing. The total number of votes cast was about sixty per cent of normal. Republican contests for both governor and senator tended to account for the interest shown

⁴ Foulke's telegram to Chairman Lee Jan. 1, in *Indianapolis Star*, Jan. 2, 1916. "As I believe these measures (initiative, referendum and recall) are necessary to insure the rule of the people against the politician and that they represent one of the most vital principles of the Progressive party. I am utterly unwilling to recant or to have my name on the ticket if they are purposely eliminated."

⁵ *Indianapolis News*, Jan. 6, 1916.

⁶ *Indianapolis Star*, March 4, 1916. Resolutions adopted at Republican state committee meeting, March 3. "It is our earnest desire that all Republicans and former Progressives who are now with us, participate in this primary. This is of the very greatest importance in order that our nominees may unquestionably be the real choice of the party membership. All who will affiliate with us this fall join now in selection of candidates."

while a storm in the afternoon tended to keep voters away from the polls. Mr. Goodrich won out over McCray for governor, while New received the senatorial nomination over Watson. The latter at first intended for a time to appeal to the state convention for a reconsideration of the vote. He contended that by eliminating Marion county from the count he had received a plurality in the state of about seven thousand over Mr. New, thus carrying the substantial and reliable Republican counties of the state. The actual returns from all counties, however, showed that Mr. New had a plurality of some 8,000, having received a majority in the populous counties.⁷ Judge Wilson received the Progressive nomination for senator, while Mr. Hanly received the vote of that party for governor. Although their vote was light, about 10,000 in all, Chairman Lee argued that it showed a party strength of some 100,000 in the state. His explanation of a heavier Republican and Democratic vote was because of contests and expenditure of money by the former, while the latter had control of the offices. That this explanation was not sufficient is evident from the fact that several leaders of the new party soon deserted it as offering no hope of victory at the polls in November.

Oswald Ryan of Anderson left the Progressives early in January, having as his excuse the assumption of power by members of the state committee to determine candidacies and platforms. "The Progressive party," said he, "was born of an unlawful assumption of power by a party committee. The successful execution of Mr. Lee's plan in this state can only insure that the party shall meet its death in the same issue in which it got its birth." The incident calls attention again to the real issue in democratic government as it is at present organized in the United States, and this is the question of the Democratic control of the great political agencies which constitute the actual government of America, the political parties. Unless the party is so organized as to make easy its control by its own citizenship there is little hope of popular control of a government which of necessity is governed by political parties. This is exactly the point which Horace C. Stilwell has been

⁷ *Indianapolis Star*, March 11, 1916.

pressing upon the attention of the Republicans of the nation. Mr. Stilwell has taken the position that the real significance of the 1912 split in the Republican party lay in the determination of the citizenship of the party to nominate the party's candidates and write its platforms, and that any constructive policy for party permanency must rest upon an equitable plan of party government. The protest of 1912 would do no good unless it developed a new type of democratic party government.⁸

In Wayne county the Progressives decided to nominate a county ticket after State Chairman Lee explained that the party need not comply with Hanly's demands. The initiative, referendum and recall could be incorporated in the state platform and if Mr. Hanly withdrew another candidate would be nominated. "I would hate to go to the Progressive national committee meeting in Chicago next week," said Mr. Lee, "and report that the banner Progressive county of the United States had run up the white flag and surrendered to the Republicans." At the meeting William D. Foulke, who had declined to run for senator on the ticket with Hanly for governor, Mayor W. W. Robbins of Richmond and Alfred Davis, each urged the continuance of the Progressive party organization. Mr. Rudolph G. Leeds, however, was very bitter in his denunciation of Mr. Hanly, whom he regarded as a political opportunist.

If Hanly—as Mr. Lee has said—expressed the opinion that he made a mistake by not affiliating with the Progressive party in 1912, then it is my opinion that he has made another mistake in becoming a near-Progressive in 1916. The Progressive party is on the down grade and I attribute this mostly to mismanagement on the part of its leaders. I am leaving the party for good.

Thus did another former ardent worker desert the cause. He then announced his intentions of supporting Goodrich for governor.⁹ Otis E. Gulley of Danville was another Progressive to return to the Republican ranks. He asked for nomination for attorney general, being urged to do so by the Hendricks county bar association in the hope of inducing other Progressives to return also. His version of the situation was that the lesson had been learned. "Our friends," he said, "may abuse

⁸ Indianapolis *Star*, Jan. 7, 1916.

⁹ Indianapolis *Star*, Jan. 9, 1916.

us, but all who are in favor of conserving the thoughtful judgment of a majority of a free people will join hands with us in an effort against the lethargy of watchful waiting."¹⁰

Former Seventh district Progressive chairman, Harry O. Chamberlin, made his first formal announcement of his return to the Grand Old Party at a ward meeting of Republicans on February 17. He fired hot shots at both New and Watson, however, urging the voters to support Robinson for senator. Watson he called "A political scarlet letter."

Without solicitation, without suggestion, without promise or thought of reward, my mind has turned to one of those men who will in the judgment of the best number of Republicans whose views I represent, more nearly bring together the discordant elements of the party than either of the others in the race.¹¹

Members of the Progressive state committee meeting in the Lemcke building at Indianapolis, February 17, reported activity in behalf of candidates in the various districts. Dates were fixed for the reorganization of state and district committees and the election of county chairmen. A resolution praising Albert J. Beveridge, and declaring the principles for which he fought while a United States senator from Indiana were then being enacted into laws, was adopted unanimously.¹²

When the state central committee met, March 30, it re-elected Edwin M. Lee state chairman and Elias D. Salsbury, secretary. Wm. Holton Dye was elected national committeeman from Indiana to take the place of Rudolph Leeds, who resigned upon his reinstatement in the Republican ranks. Mr. Dye served until the state convention elected a new national committeeman for a full term. Bert Essex of Indianapolis

¹⁰ Indianapolis *Star*, Feb. 9, 1916.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Feb. 19, 1916.

¹² Indianapolis *Star*, Feb. 18, 1916. Under the new primary law precinct committeemen chosen March 7, would meet March 11 and elect a county chairman. The state committee would instruct the county chairmen to meet on March 18, to elect district chairmen comprising the state central committee, would meet in Indianapolis to select a state chairman. The above dates were fixed at the meeting. Those present were: 1. W. E. McElderry; 2. J. N. Dyer; 3. Dr. J. B. Stalker, and Wm. A. Pierson; 4. Will H. Newsom; 5. Wm. Wallace, and Lewis McNutt; 6. H. J. Roberts, Earl Crawford, and George R. Carter; 7. Frank J. Doudican, W. D. Headrick, Elias D. Salsbury, Thomas A. Dally, and Clarence R. Martin; 8. Carl Thompson; 9. Wm. H. Dye, and J. W. Whicker; 10. Dr. G. R. Coffin, and John W. Harvey; 11. Cornelius S. McGrevey, and 12. Lyman Jackman.

was chosen as vice-chairman of the state committee with Henry S. Rominger treasurer. Chairman Lee was authorized to appoint executive, advisory, finance and convention committees, as well as to name a temporary chairman. It was decided to send thirty-four delegates to the national convention with one-half vote each. Each district was to have two delegates, except the Seventh and Thirteenth, which would have four. Four delegates at large were to be elected by the state convention. Mr. Hanly, who attended the meeting, explained that he would only ask that the party advocate the initiative, referendum and recall for local and municipal governments as a condition of his making the race for governor.

The Republican state convention met at Indianapolis on April 6 and 7, just one month after the primary election of March 7. It was a notable gathering and showed a judicious effort to win back the Progressive voters into harmonious co-operation. On the afternoon of April 6, the assemblage was addressed by the temporary chairman, Quincy A. Myers, who was a candidate for governor in the primary. He declared the Republicans had always been "patriots before partisans." Wilson's foreign policy came in for its share of criticism at the hands of the speaker. Mr. Henry D. Estabrook of New York had been engaged to extend an impressive and eloquent appeal for the Progressives to return home. He urged a united party behind the Republican candidates.

The party must get together, not as hyphenated Republicans, but as rejuvenated Republicans. When brothers fall out, they do not come together in sack-cloth and ashes nor through recriminations or aspersions of motive. They come together with a clasp of the hands, with a smile in the eyes and with the sheepish grin of mutual and affectionate condonation and say nothing. Just so must we Republicans forgive and forget.

The death of Senator Shively on the afternoon of March 14, in Washington, necessitated the nomination of two senatorial candidates instead of one. The convention was thus enabled to avoid the embarrassing task of deciding the primary election difficulty of candidates New and Watson by naming both of them. Shelby county Republicans asked that both men be selected as the proper course to pursue to obviate

all friction, promote party unity and complete harmony in the Republican party.¹³

Horace C. Stilwell, former Progressive leader, was permanent chairman of the convention. Others who were given recognition as returned prodigals were E. C. Toner for delegate at large; Thomas N. Davidson of Greensburg and D. N. Foster of Ft. Wayne for contingent electors at large; Edgar D. Bush for lieutenant governor and Harry A. Roberts of Carmel for state statistician. The platform was not radical at all but fairly progressive. No objection was made to the omission of woman suffrage and prohibition planks. On the other hand the platform declared for: the restoration of a protective tariff and for a tariff commission; for preparedness legislation at once; for a more spirited foreign policy; opposed Wilson's policies toward nations at war in Europe and toward Mexico, also the existing Democratic state administration; favored tax reforms; short ballot, home rule for cities, and giving the governor power to veto any items in a general appropriations bill.

The Democratic state convention met April 26. It nominated Thomas Taggart for the short senatorial term.¹⁴ The platform pointed out all the progressive legislation that had been passed under Democratic administrations. Some things mentioned were: An improved banking law, popular election of senators, liberal pensions, extension of parcel post, perfecting postal savings banks, income tax, strengthening of Sherman anti-trust act. In state legislation they pointed with pride to workmen's compensation, vocational education, public service commission, primary election law, the payment of state debts, anti-loan shark laws, provision for a state fire marshall, an inheritance tax law and anti-lobby law.

The Progressives planned to hold their state convention in Indianapolis, May 26, but the date was postponed. As early as March 13, it became known that many of the delegates, selected at the march primary, were holding up their views until after the Republican national convention. They were to meet in the various districts May 24, to select two delegates

¹³ Indianapolis *Star*, March 18, 1916.

¹⁴ Mr. Taggart had been appointed by Governor Ralston on March 19 to serve until a successor to Mr. Shively was elected.

and two alternates from each district and to transact any other business before the national convention. The district delegates were to meet in Indianapolis at the state headquarters on May 26, to elect four delegates and four alternates.

Reports from the various districts indicated a strong Roosevelt sentiment. Every meeting indorsed him for President. At Evansville the delegates expressed a desire for unity instructing the delegates to the national convention to vote for Roosevelt "first, last and all the time." The Second district meeting at Bloomington opposed amalgamation with the Republicans along "standpat" lines. George Ade, selected as delegate from the Tenth district at Rensselaer, expressed the opinion that Roosevelt sentiment was growing in the east as well as the west. At Terre Haute the attitude seemed to be Roosevelt or his equal, while at Connorsville it was "Roosevelt or no one."¹⁵

Early in January, Progressive leaders, at a meeting in Chicago, planned for their national convention on the same week as the Republicans. National committeemen, present at the time, confirmed the early gossip that an amalgamation of Progressives and Republicans was possible in June even if Colonel Roosevelt was not nominated. All agreed, however, that the stampeding of the Republican national conclave for the Colonel would end the deflection and make everybody happy. The Progressives hoped to agree with the Republicans on both candidate and platform without sacrificing their principles. George W. Perkins at a banquet, January 10, in the Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, maintained that the Progressive

¹⁵ Indianapolis *Star*, May 25, 1916. Delegates to the Chicago convention were: At large, Wm. C. Bobbs, Edwin M. Lee, Wm. D. Foulke and James B. Wilson; First district, W. E. McIlderry of Princeton and J. M. Israel of Petersburg; Second, John Dyer of Vincennes and Joseph E. Henley of Bloomington; Third, T. S. Jones of Corydon and A. P. Hauss of New Albany; Fourth, John A. Ross of Seymour and Will Newsom of Elizabethtown; Fifth, Louis McNutt of Brazil and Frank Hays of Greencastle; Sixth, H. T. Roberts of Greenfield and W. N. Needham of Shelbyville; Seventh, Henry S. Rominger, Willitts A. Bastian, W. D. Headrick and Clarence R. Martin of Indianapolis; Eighth, Theodore P. Shockney of Union City and Harold Hobbs of Muncie; Ninth, Dr. G. A. Schultz of Lebanon and J. W. Whicker of Attica; Tenth, George Ade of Brook and C. T. Coffin of Monticello; Eleventh, J. F. Lawrence of Peru and M. F. Anderson of Marion; Twelfth, Wm. Devilbiss and Henry F. Reiter of Fort Wayne; Thirteenth, L. C. Landon of South Bend, W. R. Andrus of Laporte, C. A. Sparkin of Warsaw and R. C. Stephens of Plymouth. The four delegates chosen in the Seventh and Thirteenth districts were allowed one-half vote each. Indianapolis *News*, May 26, 1912.

party had not gone up the spout like the Greenbackers and Populists. He arraigned the Democratic administration severely and handed hot shots to the Republican leaders.

As is always the case in great moral struggles we have had many discouragements, but now on the eve of the meeting of our national committee I am sure I voice the sentiment of every man present and the thousands of loyal men and women whom he represents, when I say that we are glad we engaged in the struggle; that we have accomplished a vast amount of good for our country, and God willing, we'll accomplish a great deal more. On the morrow practically every state will be represented by a national committeeman, ninety per cent of the men who led the fight in 1912 will be here in person or represented with the one purpose, to use their best judgment, expressed through the highest patriotism, to serve their country's broadest interests. The results of the present war are bound to open up a new world economically, religiously and politically. Our country needs leadership, leadership with vision, courage, and patriotism in order to reach a wise solution of the problems confronting us.¹⁶

In order to secure this leadership many of the Progressives were willing to join with the Republicans. They would like to have the same leader and principles as their former comrades. The Republicans, however, were not disposed to favor Roosevelt as the nominee, but seemed to consider anyone else.

Progressives gathered at an informal conference, June 4, in the convention city in order to discuss platform planks. William D. Foulke, as one of the early Indiana arrivals, was present. As finally submitted the platform was one ringing with declarations of Americanism and preparedness, military, spiritual, economic and industrial as its keynotes. It was completed in co-operation with the Republican convention platform builders. The "Americanism" planks, minus direct reference to hyphenism, declared in vigorous terms for upholding American rights on land and sea, guarding "the honor and influence of our nation," and maintaining "the integrity of international law."

The Progressives hoped to bring about the nomination of a compromise ticket by marking time until the Republicans had acted. Each convention appointed a conference commit-

¹⁶ Indianapolis *Star*, Jan. 11, 1916.

tee to negotiate with that of the other body.¹⁷ Perkin's declaration that "we are out for a matchless man and an incomparable cause," that "no one else has such a man and he is the cause, therefore we have no second choice" expressed the feeling of those Progressives who would not support any candidate but Roosevelt.

On the third ballot, June 10, Hughes and Fairbanks were named to head the Republican ticket. Mr. Roosevelt, after suggesting Mr. Lodge as a compromise candidate, declined tentatively to accept the nomination for President with John M. Parker as Vice-President, when it was tendered to him by the Progressive convention. The former President desired to learn the attitude of Mr. Hughes on the vital questions of the day. His conditional refusal was placed in the hands of the Progressive national committee. Immediately after the final adjournment, the Indiana Progressive delegates appointed a committee, consisting of W. D. Foulke, W. C. Bobbs, and Willitts A. Bastian to send a message to Mr. Roosevelt reaffirming their faith in him and insisting on his acceptance of the Progressive nomination.

Thus had the efforts to name a compromise candidate failed. The refusal of Mr. Roosevelt to accept the Progressive nomination left the members of that party in the dark. His final statement to this effect was made to the Progressive national committee when it reconvened at Chicago on June 26. The committee thereupon followed his advice and indorsed Mr. Hughes by a vote of 36 to 6. William Holton Dye, Indiana's member, voted with the majority. He was severely criticised by many for his action, while others just as freely upheld him. A stormy session resulted when the Indiana Progressives met at Indianapolis, June 28, to decide upon their future position. Men who attacked Roosevelt were called "curs" by Clarence R. Martin. July 20 was fixed as the date for the state convention of the party, being the second postponement. In the meantime party followers

¹⁷ Indianapolis *Star*, Jan. 25, 1916. Decision of members of Republican national committee, January 24, 1916. Republicans—Senator Smoot, of Utah; Murray Crane, of Massachusetts; Senator Borah, of Idaho; Nicholas Murray Butler, of New York, and A. R. Johnson, of Ohio. Progressives—George W. Perkins and Horace Wilkinson, of New York; Governor Johnson, of California; Charles J. Bonaparte, of Maryland, and John M. Parker, of Louisiana.

were asked to consider the question of calling another national convention to name another presidential candidate.

The breach over Hughes grew wider and wider. The Progressive party was being unscrambled in Indiana as well as elsewhere. It was made up in general of two elements. On one side were the devotees of Mr. Roosevelt, while on the other were the apostles of social agitation. That the party was not made up entirely of Roosevelt's personal following was clearly demonstrated by the widespread revolt against his support of Hughes. Some of these men began even at Chicago to charge him with perfidy to them and of betrayal of Progressive principles. Scholars, authors, settlement workers and such like are not dependables of any party, and who were now on fire with zeal for reform measures that filled up so large a part of the Progressive platform, had merely accepted the Colonel as the generalissimo of the new organization. He offered them spirited and sagacious leadership. He had probably accepted such a curious division of his army with something of the same utilitarian frame of mind. His personality dominated in 1912, now they were not so anxious to follow him into the Hughes camp. Some who followed him into the new party without regard for its reform propaganda had already preceded him into the reunion camps. Others wore sullen countenances and deplored his betrayal of social justice. Those of the latter class might be expected to scatter to all parties, some even to the Socialists and Prohibitionists, where they were not wholly strangers. Former Governor Hanly, whom the Progressives had expected to have at the head of their ticket, was one of the first to decline to make the race for an office. He cast his lot with the Prohibitionists, giving as his excuse the failure of the Progressive national convention to put a national prohibition plank in its platform.¹⁸

Several nominees on the Progressive county ticket in Vanderburg county announced their return to the Republican lines. The Progressives of Johnson county came out with an announcement of their intentions to support Hughes and Fairbanks, almost to a man. "The Republican platform is

¹⁸ Indianapolis *Star*, June 13, 1916.

progressive enough and the ticket suits us.”¹⁹ John C. Shaffer of the Shaffer group of newspapers, including the *Indianapolis, Muncie and Terre Haute Stars* was one who urged Mr. Roosevelt not to change his decision to support Mr. Hughes. George Ade let it be known that he was satisfied. Mr. Roosevelt’s course, he said, was shaped by a desire to see Wilson defeated. Wm. Holton Dye, Progressive national committeeman from Indiana, expressed the feeling of most of the members of that party who were willing to go back to their former allegiance. His statement was issued following a conference with both Hughes and Roosevelt.

In the event Roosevelt definitely refuses to run we are confronted with a most serious question. A continuance of the Democratic party may enable it to get such a hold on the political situation as to take many years to free the country from its inefficient and incompetent control. The Republican party controlled by the old bosses would be almost as bad, but the progressive forces under Mr. Hughes can force the bosses out of power if Mr. Hughes assumes the same attitude as President, as he did when he was governor of New York and if he has Colonel Roosevelt’s co-operation and support.²⁰

Realizing that their ranks were being steadily thinned by desertions, very few Progressives were optimistic enough to believe that victory was possible for them in November. This fact had its influence in inducing others to give up the fight and enlist with stronger forces, where there was some hope of doing some actual service. All they could hope to do as Progressives would be to go on record for principle as the Prohibition party did. There were only a few to whom such a course proved interesting. In 1912 there was a distinct chance of success at the polls, but the 1914 election had shown a decline in Progressive strength, which it was reasonable to infer had continued. In 1916 it would be either Hughes or Wilson. The Progressive national committee had recommended Hughes though it disavowed any right to deliver the votes of the party at large. The truth was that Progressives, who were not very strong party slaves, would exercise their own individual judgment in November. To the returned Progressives, Mr. Roosevelt’s action in supporting Mr. Hughes

¹⁹ *Indianapolis News*, June 14, 1916.

²⁰ *Indianapolis Star*, June 24, 1916.

was justified by adequate reasons. These reasons, they felt, would appeal to their hesitating brethren with constantly increasing force as time wore on. In inviting their support for the Republican ticket, nothing but kindness and calm reason were to be used. Roosevelt's example of personal sacrifice was one, which, in the long run, sagacity and patriotism would have to follow. The welfare of the country came first. The management of the Indiana Republican organization was unsatisfactory to many Progressives, and not without justification in the past. But the disposition to deal fairly with former Progressives was in evidence and could not fail to exert its effect except with those who were determined not to be reconciled.

Conservative Progressives in Indianapolis and elsewhere, who desired to follow Roosevelt in the 1916 campaign, talked of the formation of a Progressive alliance or league similar to the one in Illinois and other states where the party had retired from the active field. By such an alliance or league they felt it would be possible to maintain an effective organization which could be made instantly operative in subsequent political developments requiring a well organized protest movement. There was a feeling that the Progressive cause would not be advanced by committing the party as a party to the Democrats or Republicans, but that on national issues Progressives should be left free to act as the national committee suggested, according to their own consciences.²¹ The Progressive state central committee, at a meeting, July 10, adopted a resolution refusing financial assistance from either Democratic or Republican organizations during the campaign. The committee did not propose that the state convention, July 20, should indorse any candidate for President. Thomas A. Daily of Indianapolis was added to the list of possible candidates for governor.

The committee also reached an agreement to retire William H. Dye as the Progressive national committeeman from Indiana. The decision was not announced until July 13, when Mr. Lee sent a letter to Dye. His vote indorsing Hughes was branded as contrary to the wishes of the Indiana leaders.

²¹ Indianapolis *News*, July 8, 1916.

Moreover he was charged with being active behind the scenes as a member of the so-called "committee of nine," the purpose of which, Mr. Lee declared, was "to murder the Progressive party in Indiana."²² The "committee of nine" was quite active just before the state convention, in its efforts to solicit proxies from delegates who would not attend. This precipitated the question of whether or not the proxies had been issued according to the rules of the party.²³

The regular Progressives held the "whip hand" in the convention and clinched the plan for a complete state ticket. Thus they triumphed over the "insurgents" of "the committee of nine." They even nominated presidential electors. "Bogus" and "counterfeit" tickets were said to be in circulation, proxies were also in evidence, those obtained by the "committee of nine" of which Clarence R. Martin was secretary, were uniformly ruled out by the chairman. The "committee of nine" then tried to change the proxy rule, eliminate presidential electors and declare in favor of a Progressive league, instead of a straight party organization. Clarence Martin offered a truce, saying that the "committee of nine" would withdraw from the fight against nominating a state ticket if Lee resigned as state chairman. He, no doubt, believed that with Lee not exercising control a majority in the convention would "listen to reason" and decide not to put up a state ticket.²⁴

A ticket was nominated nevertheless. Thomas A. Daily was named for governor, James B. Wilson for senator, long term, and Clifford Jackman for the short term. James M. Zion of Clark's Hill was named for secretary of state. The convention turned down a proposal made by Jackson Boyd of the resolution committee to abandon a state ticket, so hard that he resigned from the party immediately. Edward R. Lewis of Indianapolis did the same.

The platform as adopted by the Progressive convention

²² This was a group of Indiana Progressives who, following Roosevelt's refusal to be a candidate for President, labored to prevent the nomination of a Progressive state ticket. *News*, July 14, 1916, also *Star* of same date.

²³ Each proxy had to be counter-signed by both the county chairman as in his failure to act the district chairman alone was empowered to validate a proxy. This covered also the case of absent delegates for whom no previous provision of proxy had been made. The rules prevented the holding of more than one delegate's vote by any individual. *Indianapolis Star*, July 19, 1916.

²⁴ *Indianapolis News*, July 20, 1916.

reiterated the demands and principles advocated in 1912 and 1914. It declared that the Republican platform was reactionary. The Democratic party had been given a chance, but did not improve it. They had been forced by Progressive strength to pass a workman's compensation act and a direct primary act. Moreover the Democrats were accused of ignoring other demands of the Progressive platform of 1914, and prepared by the Progressive legislative committee to strengthen the child labor laws, provide free school books, civil service reform, abolish convict contract labor, preventing industrial diseases and accidents, preventing or restraining injunctions in labor disputes, passing a minimum wage law, giving cities a commission form of government and counties a business form of overnment, "blue sky" laws, good roads and reform of court procedure. The party pledged itself anew to these reforms. Besides, they demanded economy, the short ballot, a new constitution and prohibition by national and state constitutional amendment.

A national Progressive conference was held at Indianapolis on August 3. Representatives from seventeen states were present and outlined a program for their future work. It was decided that national committeemen who had indorsed Hughes should resign from their places, paving the way for a reorganization of the committee and the recovery of the party's machinery from Perkins and Hughes supporters. They declared in favor of John W. Parker's plan for centering the Progressive campaign in a few doubtful states where there was a possibility of making the party a decisive factor in the national election. In order to manage the national campaign a committee of fifteen was appointed to act in place of the national committee in advising state organizations. Subsequent conferences were provided to rehabilitate the party and after the fall election a national convention was suggested to consider the amalgamation of minor parties and independent voters.²⁵ The conferences decided that the action of individual Progressives on the presidency should be left to their individual judgments and consciences.

In August the campaign opened. The Republican state

²⁵ *Indianapolis Star*, Aug. 4, 1916.

campaign committee contained the names of a number of former Progressives, among them being those of George Ade, W. C. Bobbs, Neil McGrevey, William Endicott and Edward C. Toner. County committees followed the example of the state committee in inviting the Progressives to join with them. They expected thereby to receive the lion's share of the Progressive vote. On September a Hughes Alliance was formed at Indianapolis. Its membership included men previously identified with other parties. Willitts A. Bastian, former Seventh district Progressive chairman, was elected president; F. S. Max Puett of Rockville, a former Democrat, became secretary; Winfield Miller of Indianapolis, a Republican, treasurer, and Clarence R. Martin, a leading Progressive, field secretary. The sole requirement for membership was the support of Hughes. A general campaign committee and an executive committee were provided for. Local and auxiliary branches were organized in order to gather up independent voters, dissatisfied Democrats and Progressives.²⁶

Former Senator Albert J. Beveridge, in July, announced his intention of taking the stump in behalf of Hughes. The regular Republicans welcomed his return because he was considered one of the leading Progressives and no doubt existed as to his oratorical abilities. The course taken by Mr. Beveridge, could not fail to influence others of the Bull Moose party, who hesitated to take a like step before that time. Judge James B. Wilson withdrew from the party in August. He had been nominated for senator at the March primary so that his retirement necessitated the appointment of a successor. While he still believed in the Progressive principles there was no hope for his election so that it seemed the course of wisdom to allow voters freedom of choice between candidates of the old parties. John Napier Dyer of Vincennes was picked as Mr. Wilson's successor for the long senatorial term. For the short term John F. Clifford of Connersville was named, taking the place of Clifford Jackman of Huntington, who resigned to cast his lot with the Prohibitionist party. The Progressive had no candidate for judge of the superior court, Second district, after J. Oscar Hall of Shelbyville refused to allow his name on the ballot.

²⁶ *Indianapolis News*, Sept. 5; *Indianapolis Star*, Sept. 6, 1916.

As the campaign wore on it became still more evident that the Progressives would not make much of a showing. Reports from the Maine election indicated a clean sweep for the Republicans. In Indiana there were many cases where Progressive county tickets withdrew in favor of the Republican nominees.²⁷ The party leaders were confronted with a difficult problem because they had neither speakers nor funds.²⁸ It was merely a fight between the Republicans and Democrats. Each of these parties had a candidate for Vice-President from Indiana, and in addition there was the added interest resulting from two senatorial campaigns as well as the Goodrich-Adair contest for governor. President Wilson visited the state on October 12, attending a good roads meeting and the state Centennial Celebration in Indianapolis. Later he spoke at Goshen, Elkhart, and South Bend on his way to Chicago. William G. McAdoo, secretary of the treasury, on the same date spoke at Ft. Wayne along with Senators Kern and Taggart in an effort to bolster up Democratic chances in the state. Mr. Hughes covered the state very well in two tours through it. The first, September 21-23, was over the northern part. On October 31 and November 1, just before the election, he made a hasty canvass of the southern section, giving especial attention to the German element there. Mr. Roosevelt, Raymond Robins and George Ade all spoke in behalf of the Republican nominee, urging the Progressives to support him since their own party was no longer of any consequence.

The Democrats based their claims for reinstatement on the record of Wilson's administration including legislation against child labor, for an eight hour law, rural credits, a federal reserve act, a tariff commission and workman's compensation. Besides this it was argued that the President had preserved the neutrality of the nation thus avoiding any serious loss to

²⁷ Indianapolis *Star*, Sept. 12, 1916. Some instances of note were Grant, Vigo, Fountain and Hamilton counties.

²⁸ As evidences of this one needs only to compare the campaign expenses of the Progressive senatorial nominee with those of the Republicans and Democrats: Taggart, \$3,287.79; Kern, \$1,250; New, no contributions, but \$3,000 expenses; John F. Clifford and J. N. Dyer, Progressives, no contributions and no expenses; Elwood Haynes, Prohibitionist, no expenses but \$5,200 contributed to National Prohibition committee and \$450 to Indiana state committee. Indianapolis *Star*, Oct. 31, 1916.

our people which would result from participation in the great European war. They built up their hope around this President whom they apparently regarded as stronger than his party.

The Progressives practically disappeared as a party after the election. The vote cast for their nominee was almost negligible. None of their candidates on the state ticket received as many as 5,000 votes or one-third of the support given to Prohibitionist or Socialist candidates. Progressive nominees for congress received very little consideration, only the Fifth, Ninth, Eleventh and Thirteenth districts giving them more than 1,000 votes.²⁹

Evidently practically all the 1912 Progressive vote was this year given to the Republicans. The latter party was thus enabled to elect its state ticket and Hughes electors. As intimated elsewhere the Progressives were reconciled to their former allegiance because it was evident that they could not accomplish anything except through their influence and not through actual control of the government. George Ade expressed the true vision of the situation in explaining his own case when he said:

I marched with the Progressive party until it became a dwindling minority of bleeding martyrs and I would have continued to march if there had been a probability of our arriving anywhere. I liked my travelling companions and the scenery, but a man can not continue a journey which offers no terminus. When a man has just one round of ammunition to shoot he can't afford to stand off on a hillside and shoot into the air. Progressives must recognize the fact that this year there are only two contending parties and every voter must either make a quick choice or retire to the deep woods. This is no time for grieving over what might have been. The thing for every Progressive to do is to look pleased and vote for Hughes.³⁰

The Republican party elected many of its state tickets in the north and west, but lost in the electoral race. One would

²⁹ *Report of Secretary of State*, 1916, pp. 206-208.

³⁰ *Indianapolis Star*, Oct. 21, 1916. Raymond Robins told a similar story. He supported the Republicans because he felt that they held out more to the Progressives. He differed with his Progressive friends "who did not know when they were dead." He did not believe in "staying at a wake until the corpse" then him "out of the room." *Indianapolis Star*, Nov. 2, 1916.

naturally think that if it was right for Progressives in Indiana, Illinois and New York to vote for Hughes they should do so in California and Washington. In the latter states the voters decided on extraneous circumstances more than upon the ordinary political issues. The Republicans had made a blunder in attacking President Wilson rather than his party. Some of the western electorate thereupon seemed to fear that the country would suffer because Republican orators spoke in disrespectful terms of the chief executive. No doubt Hughes' plurality in Indiana was reduced to some extent by this argument, and the love of peace at any price. Indiana's Republican organization was likely the best of any state. The old leaders there had not ignored the Progressives but made an effort to give them places on the various party organization committees. The Progressive leaders asked for a continuance of this recognition in the future. Gifford Pinchot, Raymond Robibns, James R. Garfield, William Allen White and others made such a plea in a meeting at Chicago on December 7. This action was followed on the next day by a similar demand from the regular Progressive party through the acting chairman, Matthew Hale.³¹

With the 1916 election the Progressives ceased to exist as a political party in Indiana. A desire for united effort along lines, incident to the great war, led voters to walk in accustomed paths instead of insisting upon radical changes. The old guard machinery was rapidly restored so that by the 1918 campaign there was scarcely any evidence of Progressivism in its make up. Former Progressive leaders were not found in positions of influence in the old party. Most all third party movement created a large independent vote. Of this, the largest of all such parties, a proportionately large and patent group of political mavericks was the result. These men are not the property of any party. They resent the idea of being accomplices of any bosses or unscrupulous party leaders. Whether or not the Progressive movement will again be organized into an independent political party is of course uncertain, and any statement to that effect would be mere conjecture. A large majority of the Progressives left the Re-

³¹ Indianapolis *Star*, Dec. 7, 1916.

publican party and afterward returned to it. They still believe in the Progressive principles, and their number is large enough to command the respect of the party with which they are identified.

A HISTORY OF INDIANA

From Its Exploration To 1918

In two volumes, 1,120 pages.

BY

LOGAN ESAREY, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Western History in Indiana University

VOL. I.

- I THE FRENCH IN INDIANA.
- II THE ENGLISH PERIOD, 1764-1779.
- III THE CONQUEST OF VIRGINIA.
- IV CLOSING CAMPAIGNS OF THE REVOLUTION.
- V INDIAN WARS, 1790-1796.
- VI GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY.
- VII INDIANA TERRITORY, 1800-1816.
- VIII INDIANA AND THE WAR OF 1812.
- IX FROM TERRITORY TO STATE.
- X THE STATE GOVERNMENT AT CORYDON, 1816-1825.
- XI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1825-1835.
- XII RELIGION AND EDUCATION IN EARLY INDIANA.
- XIII POLITICS FROM 1825 TO 1840.
- XIV REMOVAL OF THE INDIANS FROM THE STATE.
- XV THE PUBLIC LAND IN INDIANA.
- XVI SYSTEMATIC INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.
- XVII THE SECOND BANK IN INDIANA.
- XVIII THE PIONEERS AND THEIR SOCIAL LIFE.
- XIX THE MEXICAN WAR.
- XX THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1850.
- XXI POLITICS FROM 1840 TO 1852.

VOL. II.

- XXII INDIANA IN THE FIFTIES.
- XXIII CIVIL WAR POLITICS.
- XXIV THE COMMON SCHOOLS.
- XXV BUILDING THE RAILROADS.
- XXVI RECONSTRUCTION.
- XXVIII AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.
- XXIX GREENBACKS AND GRANGERS.
- XXX MINING.
- XXXI STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM.
- XXXII THE TARIFF QUESTION.
- XXXIII THE INDIANA CITIES.
- XXXIV THE COLLEGES.
- XXXV COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT.
- XXXVI POPULISTS, SOCIALISTS AND PROGRESSIVES.
- XXXVII MILITARY HISTORY SINCE THE CIVIL WAR.
- XXXVIII LITERARY HISTORY.

"Prof. Logan Esarey, of Indiana University, has written the History of Indiana from its earliest exploration to 1918. No man in the middle west is better equipped to perform this splendid task for the Hoosier commonwealth."

L. N. HINES, *State Supt. Elect.*

PRICE PER SET, POSTPAID \$8.00. SINGLE VOLUME \$4.00
Sent on approval to libraries. Address

all communications to

LOGAN ESAREY,
Bloomington, Indiana.

Rare Books on American and Indiana History for Sale

Terrell's Reports—Indiana in the Civil War, 8 vols.	\$8.00
Banta, Historical Sketch of Johnson County	1.00
Indiana's Roll of Honor, Civil War, Vol. 1	2.00
The Indiana Soldier—Civil War—2 vols.	4.00
Streightoff, Indiana, A Social and Economic Survey	1.00
Moore, Hoosier Cyclopedia	1.00
Wylie, Indiana University 1828-1890	1.00
Harding, Indiana University 1828-1904	1.00
Dye—Some Torch Bearers of Indiana	1.00
Woodburn, Higher Education in Indiana	1.00
Clark's Campaign in Illinois—Pirtle	1.50
Henry, Political Platforms of Indiana	1.00
Moore, History of Hanover College	1.00
Young, History of Wayne County	1.00
Dunn, Indiana	1.00
Howe, The Great West	1.00
Legislative and State Manual, set	8.00
Woodburn, Hall's New Purchase	1.25
Dillon, History of Indiana	7.50
Burnet, Notes of the Northwest Territory	5.00
Foulke, Life of Morton, 2 vols.	5.00
Monks, Courts and Lawyers of Indiana, 3 vols.	15.00
Sweet, Circuit Rider Days in Indiana	1.50
Levering, Historic Indiana	2.00
Howe, Historical Collections of Ohio, 2 vols.	3.00
Thayer, Life of John Hay, 2 vols.	4.00
Strickland, Autobiography of Peter Cartwright	1.00
Moore, Life of Schuyler Colfax	1.50
Thompson, Stories of Indiana	1.00
Shirts, Primitive History of Hamilton County	1.50
Eggleston, First of the Hoosiers	1.00
Harrison, This Country of Ours	1.00
Blaine, Twenty Years of Congress, 2 vols.	5.00
Dunn, True Indian Stories	1.00
Brevier Reports, per vol.	.50

ADDRESS THIS MAGAZINE

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

CONTENTS

	Page
HINDOSTAN, GREENWICH AND MT. PLEASANT-----	
<i>George R. Wilson</i>	285
A PIONEER WEDDING -----	
<i>Esther McNitt</i>	303
THE POCKET IN INDIANA HISTORY-----	
<i>T. J. de la Hunt</i>	308
HISTORY OF MADISON -----	
<i>Women's Club of Madison</i>	317
REVIEWS AND NOTES -----	
	352


PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.00 PER YEAR SINGLE COPY, 50 CENTS

Entered as second-class matter September 16, 1913, at the postoffice at
Bloomington, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Bound Volumes of this Magazine since 1914
can be furnished by the publishers at
\$3.00, postpaid.

—Map—
showing Pioneer Land
Owners at Mt. Pleasant
Greenwich and Hindostan.
The
highways are as of various
dates between 1897 and 1902.



(Geo. R. Wilson. JAN. 1920)

INDIANA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COOPERATION OF

THE INDIANA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

THE INDIANA STATE LIBRARY

BOARD OF EDITORS

JAMES A. WOODBURN, PH.D., Professor of American History
and Politics, Indiana University

SAMUEL B. HARDING, PH. D.

GEORGE S. COTTMAN, Former Editor, Madison

WILLIAM O. LYNCH, A.M., Professor of History, Indiana State
Normal School

HARLOW LINDLEY, A.M., State Archivist, Professor of History,
Earlham College

JACOB P. DUNN, LL.B., Secretary Indiana Historical Society

DEMARCHUS C. BROWN, A.M., State Librarian

LOGAN ESAREY, PH. D., Managing Editor

Associate Professor of Western History, Indiana University

Subscription Price, \$2.00 per year.

Single Number, 50 Cents.

Copyright, 1920, by
Indiana University

INDIANA

MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

VOL. XVI

DECEMBER, 1920

No. 4

Hindostan, Greenwich and Mt. Pleasant. The Pioneer Towns of Martin County.—Memoirs of Thomas Jefferson Brooks

*Edited by George R. Wilson.**

HINDOSTAN

January 6, 1873.

Practically the first settlement of Martin county, then a part of Daviess county, was at the falls, on the east fork of White river. A few hunters may have built cabins in this territory at an earlier date. Frederick Sholts entered the land and sold it to a company. The company made the after payments on most of it, and laid out the town of Hindostan. Captain Fellows, one of the company, gave the town its name. Captain Fellows had resided in India many years. Things now looked so bright for a fortune, he said, "let it be Hindostan."

The company laid out many lots of small dimensions, and many that contained from five to fifty acres. This was in 1818 or 1819. Many were sold at high prices. The sickness of 1819 and 1820 caught the settlers in their log cabins and shanties, and the forest unbroken around them. They were

*Note: Thomas Jefferson Brooks, of a distinguished and renowned family, an early pioneer of Martin county, and one of the first merchants of Portersville, in Dubois county, was born December 29, 1805, and went to Martin county in 1823. He lived first at Hindonstan, afterwards, for a short time, in Orange county, then at Mt. Pleasant, and later at Loogootee. For many years he lived on his farm one mile west of the old town of Mt. Pleasant, in Martin county. He held many offices of public trust. He died December 11, 1882, and now lies buried in God's Acre, at Mt. Pleasant. In his old age he collected valuable information with a view of writing a history of the pioneer days of Martin county. He passed away before he had all the data compiled. The following items were taken from his collection, and are presented in practically his own language, by George R. Wilson, of Jasper, Indiana.

unacclimated. All were sick but Rufus Brown and many died. The pioneers had built grist mills, and saw mills, but many became disheartened and found ways to leave, so by the year 1824 they were reduced in numbers, until only one-half remained. Much of their energy and means were gone, and they had failed to erect the county building.

These Hindostan pioneers started the manufacture of the famous Hindostan oil stone. They hauled the stone from near French Lick over a road now lost, or nearly so. At first it may have been profitable, but the business yielded to sickness and bad management. By 1824 Hindostan had several well-built houses, and the county could muster a very good regiment on regimental day, with a variety of arms and costumes.

After 1824, Hindostan went down, and the county seat was taken away. It is now farm land. No man can find a street or lot, and they are no longer so designated on the tax duplicates. Even The Falls have changed—not down, but up. At one time there were several hundred voters at Hindostan; now the only voter there goes miles to get to vote. Such is time.

The writer thinks back for names of those days; many come at the bidding, and in days after he can recall more and more. Of others he can recall character and circumstances, as well as names. Of others, again, he can tell but little. Many are left and lost to him; here one, there one. I know of only one citizen of the place that came in 1819 now left near me. That is Mrs. William McFee, the mother of Mrs. Thomas M. Gibson, who is now (1873) confined to her room. There are but few descendants of early settlers left within my knowledge.

Nearly all the Indians had left. Captain John and White Eyes and a few others, and a half-breed family were still here in 1819. William McGowan was killed by an Indian a short time before (1812), a little above Mt. Pleasant. Some thought a white man may have done it on "Indian credit."

The first man to come to this county that I have met is James Horsey. He came, as a boy, in 1811, to his brother, Lemuel, who came in 1809. He resides here now (1873), a hale old man. Judge Joel Halbert, William Dougherty and

James Stephens were here at an early day; so was Josiah Hunt, from Ohio. Mr. Halbert came from South Carolina and settled near the place where the O. & M. [B. & O.] now crosses the river. He bought a large tract of land, but Hindostan was the town, and was to be the center of this part of the state.

The three brothers, John M., Thomas and James Prentiss, were prominent settlers of Hindostan. John and Thomas died; then James went to New York. There is but one descendant left to my knowledge, a daughter of Thomas, now the wife of John Van Trees of Washington. She is the mother of a large family.

Frederick Sholts was an active man. His family is not known here now. His brothers, Mathias and Jacob, left children which are yet in this vicinity. Jesse Shelmire left children; one, Mrs. Graham of Washington, still lives and has sons and daughters. John Meriam left three daughters. Eliza A. P. married Charles R. Brown, then John Wise of Vincennes, and is yet living. Mary C. married Lewis Brooks; left two daughters. Helen married William Lewis, has sons and daughters.

My knowledge is so limited I will not try to name all those early settlers, nor tell whence they came. However, here are a few: Benjamin Adams, native of Newberryport, Massachusetts, came in 1820. He was a carpenter, and moved to New Albany in 1825. He lived to an old age. His youngest son, Thomas Adams, was for many years a pilot on the Mississippi. He is now a hardware merchant in Loogootee. Dr. John Tenant came from Richmond, Virginia, but returned east in 1825. Nat Gardner came from "Yankee States." Fred Sholts' father and mother died here. Thomas Fairchild, an Irishman, has children left at Washington, Indiana. Jesse Shelmire, a merchant, came from Philadelphia in 1819. He died and his family settled on Lost river. His daughter, Mrs. Graham, still lives. Mr. and Mrs. Nye were English. He died here. John Price left. John Wilcox came from New Albany. His wife was a Heddon. Daniel Hewes came from Louisville and went back about 1826. Mr. and Mrs. Doane came from Philadelphia. James and John Eberling were brick makers. Their first kiln of brick would not burn red.

Now, after fifty years, they may be found about the commons as perfect as the day they came from the molds. They were made a little below where Mr. Norcrass has built. John Meriam was a native of Concord, Massachusetts. He married Eliza Prentiss, who came from Vermont. Dr. Strickland came from Richmond, Virginia. Cyrus Goff came from Ohio and went to New Albany in 1825. Mr. and Mrs. DeLong went back to New York. Charles R. Brown, lawyer, married E. A. P. Merriam, now Mrs John Wise. Rufus Brown was a native of Massachusetts; came here from New York. He lived many years. He first married Catherine Berry, and later a Miss Frain. He was the only one escaping the great sickness. His sons, Abner and Thomas, are yet in the county. Sanford, a younger brother, who was a cabinet maker, married a Miss Clements and a Mrs. Doherty. Lewis R. Rogers lived to an old age in this county. He came from Virginia and left sons and daughters. Julius Johnson came from the state of New York. John Barnes came from New York. He was single and left in 1825 or 1826. George Athern, a merchant, died here. Amos and George Harris were carpenters. Their descendants now live in the county. Rev. Pfeiffer, an Episcopal clergyman, came in 1822 or 1823, and left in 1825. Jonathan Brody was a colored blacksmith from Madison, Indiana. Simon Thrasher came from New York. Samuel Hunt, Henry Hunt, Oliver W. Stephens, Hezekiah Watson, and a man named Emons were citizens. Bentley Taylor moved to Patoka. Joseph Clements was one of the early sheriffs of the county. A man by the name of White used to keep a tavern. John C. Clark and his wife, who was a McCutchen, came from Chillicothe, Ohio. Jonathan Prosser taught school. Arnold Andrews was said to be part Indian. Guy C. Watterman, a carpenter, came from Boston. Nat Hammett, a saddler, came from Boston, and has one child living here. A man by the name of Mancer was also a saddler. Charles Allen, John Darniel, Isaac Smith, a man by the name of Seymour, an Irishman by the name of Kelly, and Jacob Lastley also lived at Hindostan. William McFee came from Alexandria, Virginia. The family were English and Irish. Timothy Moses came from Massachusetts. Arden Moses married Rachiel Pierce. They came from Wheeling. A man by

the name of McGowan left Hindostan and went to St. Louis. A settler by the name of John Smith was called "Gray Head." An Englishman by the name of Haslam was the first person buried at Hindostan. His widow moved away. Plasters' creek was named after Michael Plasters, a pioneer.

The above list of names I recall, with the aid of Mrs. McFee. Many of these men had families. I have mentioned those who have descendants in the county, as I recall them, but I am convinced many names are omitted. I know where some are located, but their names are lost to me. The land around Hindostan was entered under the old credit policy of the United States; that is, to be paid for on the installment plan. Much of the land was forfeited to the government. Few opened farms, so their supplies had to be brought from Orange and Daviess counties. Bread was especially difficult to get. The woods gave them meat. A large saddle of venison could be had for a trifle. The sugar trees gave them sugar. Heavy articles were brought in keel-boats. The pioneers raised corn and hogs. Corn and bacon and the Hindostan oil stone were taken to market in flat boats.

MT. PLEASANT

A few items of the early settlement of Mt. Pleasant and vicinity may be of interest. I saw much of the early settlers here when I came, and learned much from them. There never were many Indians about Mt. Pleasant. The last lodge of them lived near the mouth of Boggs' creek, it is said. The first white settler was William McGowan. He was killed by Indians in his cabin, at the place where Harrison's Trace crossed White river, near the island. The others were Hall, Hunt, Davis, Criss, Teverbaugh, Smith and Gootee. Gootee may have been here first. These pioneers were here in 1818 or 1819. Smith was called "Laughing John." There may have been a few other pioneers. Four of these names are no longer with us (1873). Among later settlers were the Raney, Tewells, Ridge, Myers, Canaries, Rubys, Berrys, and a host of others, mostly from Kentucky. Some had money to enter land, paid part, and carried part on time, as land was then sold. Times became hard and many of them forfeited their land for non-payment. Congress allowed relinquishment of

one tract to fully pay on another. Those times tried. There were no roads, no wagons. No produce they could make would pay to haul to the Ohio river, seventy miles. Only a few skins brought any money in. What they brought went into the land office, never to circulate here any more.

An incident was related of one of the first families who came. They slept in troughs, and if a neighbor dropped in, the children would run to hide their nakedness to the troughs and pull the skins over them. But workers dressed skins for their children. Even young ladies had buckskin dresses and moccasins to match. If thread was needed, the woman went to her wheel with a distaff full of flax and made it. (If you do not know what a distaff is, ask some old pioneer woman.) If the mother wanted soap, she started the boys and dogs for 'possums for their oil. If her needle got lost, a child was sent perhaps a mile to borrow one. The wash tubs were troughs. The first settlers on Mr. Gibson's place went there March 1, 18—. He and his wife, now living, cleared land enough to grow corn for themselves and sold some to newcomers. She says they burned logs "till way in the night" every night. Later in life, one morning, she took her child and some linen thread and went a mile, wove six yards of goods, took it half a mile to a little store, and got six yards of calico and came home by night. She says: "Women worked, if they did not vote."

John Smith, of laughing notoriety, settled where Nicholas Cussick now lives (1873), in section one, township two north, range five west. It is told of him that upon meeting a Kentuckian at Hindostan, a wager was made as to who could laugh the longer. After an hour or more of a "set to," lying down, rolling over amid a large laughing crowd, witnessing the trial, the Kentuckian gave up. Smith said to him, "I had only begun to smile." Smith had a large family. All left Hindostan but one daughter.

A bride of 1818 related this incident to me a few days ago. When they were on their way to this (Martin) county, they passed through Louisville. She had two dollars, so she bought cups and saucers (not a hat, such as our girls delight to have on their heads). She took them in her lap on her horse. On crossing the Ohio, she set them down to assist with

the stock, and the stock broke them. She gathered the sound ones and the pieces and brought all along to within a mile of her intended final camp. A settler who had been here two years rushed from his cabin, with his leather apron thumping on his leather pants, to greet the new neighbors that were to be. He frightened her horse, and she was thrown, and more dishes were broken. She saved the pieces, and for nearly ten years she had no others. This new couple worked hard for themselves and others. They reared thirteen children. Seven boys are now (1873) living, all well-to-do farmers. The girls are doing their full part in building up our country. The father is yet with us, goes to his daily labor, rejoicing over the prosperity of his children. Their mother toiled early and late in the cotton and flax patches, at the wheel and loom to clothe them. Is it not time we gather together the names of such fathers and mothers? They settled at Loo-gootee, but before the town was there.

Miss E. A. P. Merriam, who became the wife of Attorney Charles R. Brown, and after his death the wife of John Wise of Vincennes, in 1872, wrote Thomas J. Brooks as follows:

Vincennes, November 6, 1872.

Mr. Thos. J. Brooks:

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 25th was received. With regard to the early settlement of Martin county, could I see you I could give much information that might interest as well as amuse you relative to many little incidents that occurred when we first came to the county, which was in July, 1818, in company with my uncle, Thomas G. Prentiss' family and Dr. Porter's from Lexington, Kentucky. We stopped at Porter's Retreat, three miles from Mt. Pleasant, remained until March, 1819, when my father, together with my uncles, James and John M. Prentiss, came out and purchased a farm at the Falls of White river from Colonel Fred Sholts (colonel of a militia company at this place), and laid out the town of Hindostan. Caleb Fellows becoming one of the proprietors, and being the eldest, as a matter of courtesy was requested to name the town. Having spent some time in India, and being partial to the country, gave it the name of Hindostan. Judge Halbert was appointed one of the commissioners to lay off the county seat. At the expiration of a year our town numbered five hundred inhabitants; people flocked in from every direction, and many were obliged to occupy their boats for houses, as they came by water. General Harrison, when on his way to Vincennes, took tea with us, on a dry goods box, and enjoyed it as much as if we had been in a palace. At that time a table was a scarce article; we were obliged to send to Liverpool (Washington), twenty-one miles, to get one. I spent that winter at Mr. Savage's,

in Louisville. While there was shopping with a Miss Bakewell, when we met two gentlemen, who inquired who I was, and being told I was from Hindostan, followed me into the store. After taking a good look at me, remarked, I was "whiter than the Americans." His friend laughed heartily, as he supposed he had seen a live Hindoo direct from India. The summer following quite a number of our friends came out from Louisville to spend a few weeks. While there the sickness commenced and they were obliged to return. That fall my uncle, Thomas Prentiss, and wife died, together with John M. Prentiss, Nat Gardner, Mr. Bond (a nephew of my father's from Boston), and my uncle's housekeeper, Mrs. Childs. But one person, Rufus Brown, in the town escaped being affected by the dreadful scourge. I regret not being able to fill your blanks, as I have not the dates. Shall have to refer you to my sister, who has the family Bible, and Julius Porter of Greenville, from whom you may derive considerable information.

Charles R. Brown was born in Southbury, Connecticut, graduated at Yale College, New Haven, came to this county, 1818, practiced law in Washington until twenty-one when he came to Hindostan and we were married May 7th. He died in Washington, April 5, 1831, aged thirty-six years and five months. He had five children, two of whom are with me; the others died quite young.

MR. WILSON'S SUPPLEMENT

Martin county was organized by an act of the legislature, January 17, 1820, and the act went into effect February 1, 1820. It has had many county seat changes, but these changes are of more recent years and do not come within the scope of this article. Benjamin Adams had the contract to build a court house at Hindostan for \$4,185. The contract was made June 5, 1820. Mt. Pleasant became the county seat September 1, 1828. The first court in Martin county convened at the house of Joseph D. Clements, in the town of Hindostan, on Friday, March 17, 1820. Jonathan Doty was president judge, and Ezekiel Porter and Frederick Sholtz associate judges. James Prentiss, mentioned by Mr. Brooks, was an associate, but he left the county in August, 1825. Rufus Brown, so singularly spoken of, became a probate judge, August 20, 1829. John R. Porter became a president judge, July 28, 1824, and served until January 20, 1830. General W. Johnson, spoken of as the first land owner at Mt. Pleasant, was a president judge, in 1831.

Hindostan Falls are known only by the name Falls in the survey records of Nathan Bent, the government surveyor who surveyed the township containing the Falls, in December,

1804. The Falls are thirty-one chains south of a point thirteen chains east of the northwest corner of section ten, township two north, of range four west. On the section line just above the Falls the river is six and one-half chains (429 feet) across. The Falls have a drop of between three and four feet. The river at the Hindostan neighborhood is about 145 yards across.

Hindostan was in section ten, township two north, range four west. It was platted between March 13 and May 29, 1819. There was a ferry between the town of Hindostan and the town of Greenwich.

Often the man who entered a piece of land, on the partial payment plan, would sell his claim, in which case the patent was issued to the buyer of the claim, and the sale was usually dated at the time final settlement was made, thus a tract of land was often cultivated many months before the recorded date.

On October 20, 1814, Frederick Sholts entered land at Hindostan. On March 3, 1819, he sold a three-fourths interest in the land on which Hindostan was afterward laid out, and town lots twelve and twenty-four in Greenwich, to John Meriam. Greenwich was the first town laid out at the Falls.

On December 10, 1807, Frederick Sholts entered 524 acres, all of section ten east and north of White river, and on November 17, 1815, he entered 188 acres, all of section nine north of White river. On December 10, 1807, John T. Mansfield entered 398 acres, all in section nine, and 66 acres, all in section ten, south and west of White river. He also entered 92.52 acres in section eight; part of it as late as June 28, 1839. In September, 1830, Frederick Sholts gave notice of forfeited land stock in sections one, seven and eight, township two north, range four west, and claimed his rights under the law of March 31, 1830.

In the *Western Sun* of November 16, 1822, appears a notice of the sale of fifty-six lots in the town of Hindostan, by Lewis R. Rogers, clerk of Martin county, wherein Charles R. Brown, one of the administrators of the estate of John M. Prentiss, deceased, offers these lots for sale. Notices of the proposed sale were also published in Louisville papers, and posted at Frederick Sholts' tavern and John C. Clark's tavern.

In the *Western Sun and General Advertiser*, on October 9, 1824, is a copy of a tax collector's sale, wherein hundreds of acres of land about Hindostan and Mt. Pleasant, and many lots in the towns of Hindostan, Greenwich and Mt. Pleasant, are offered for sale for taxes due. The sale took place at the house of Frederick Sholts, in Hindostan, on Monday, November 15, 1824.

The following notice concerning Hindostan is taken from the diary of William Faux, who passed over the Trace in 1819, on his way to visit the Birkbeck Settlement in southern Illinois:

October 29, 1819.

Breakfasted at an infant ville, Hindostan, on the falls of White river, a broad, crystal stream, running navigable to the Ohio (Wabash), over a bed of sand and stone, smooth and white as a floor of marble. The baby ville is flourishing, much building is in progress, and promises to become a pleasant, healthy town before I see it again. The land, too, is rich and inviting. I now crossed White river in my chariot.

In John Scott's *Indiana Gazetteer*, published at Center-ville, in 1826, page 68, this mention is made of Hindostan:

The county seat of Martin county is situated on the east bank of the east fork of White river, eleven miles north of Portersville, eighteen east of Washington, thirty-five south of Burlington, fifteen west of Paoli, and eighty-five southwest from Indianapolis, north latitude 38° 30', west longitude 9° 40'.

In the *Western Sun*, April 1, 1820, Edmund Dana, a great traveler and explorer, advertised the sale of his book, *Geographical Sketches of the Western Country*, by subscription. Among the men to whom subscriptions might be given was John M. Prentiss, Hindostan. It is a curious fact that Dana's book mentions about every town and village at that time in Indiana, except this group of Martin county towns.

On page 203 of *Early Western Travels*, Volume XI, appears this memorandum:

The first settler came to Hindostan in 1817, and some six additional families arrived before the town was platted (1819). It was chosen as the seat of Martin county upon its organization (1820), but the site proved so unhealthful that it was abandoned.

In the *Indiana Gazetteer*, published in 1833, on page 86, is this entry:

Hindostan, a village in Martin county, on the east fork of White river, about three miles south of Mount Pleasant. It was formerly the

seat of justice of Martin county, but since the establishment of Mount Pleasant as the county seat, Hindostan has been gradually declining, and is now nearly depopulated.

In the same book, page 127, is this record:

Mount Pleasant, a post town and seat of justice, of Martin county. It is situated on the west bank of the east fork of White river, on the state road leading from New Albany to Vincennes. The site is elevated about a hundred and fifty feet above the bed of the river. There are several springs of excellent water in and near the town, and it is surrounded by an extensive body of good farming land, a part of which is of the richest quality. It contains about thirty dwelling houses and one hundred and fifty inhabitants. The public buildings are a jail and a spacious brick court house. It has four mercantile stores, one tavern, a postoffice, two preachers of the gospel, two physicians, one common school with a good teacher, a number of craftsmen of various trades, and a mill propelled by horse power. It is about eighty-seven miles southwest from Indianapolis, north latitude $38^{\circ} 35'$, west longitude $9^{\circ} 40'$.

Books were opened at Mt. Pleasant on the first Monday in June, 1830, for the sale of stock in the New Albany and Vincennes turnpike.

The *Historical Atlas of Indiana*, 1876, pages 324 and 325, says:

Mt. Pleasant was the first settlement. William McGowan settled there in 1811 and conducted a ferry on the road from Clarksville. Hindostan was the second settlement, 1817. Frederick Sholts was one of the founders. In 1818 Joseph Clements, John Prentiss, Henry and Thomas Prentiss, George Harris, the Shelmire family and Lewis Brooks arrived. William Hunter and John Ray came in 1819.

Morris Birkbeck, an English Quaker farmer, in 1817, made a trip through Indiana. In a well written report, published in 1818, is found this reference to Schultz's tavern:

July 12, 1817. This beautiful country continues as far as Schultz's Tavern, on White river, thirty-six miles east of Vincennes. Most of this hilly district is unentered, and remains open to the public at two dollars an acre. July 13, 1817. The road from Schultz's Tavern to this place (Vincennes), thirty-six miles, is partly across "barrens," that is, land of middling quality, thinly set with timber, or covered with long grass and shrubby underwood.

In the memoirs of William Forster, a minister of the Society of Friends in England, in 1821, who spent several months in Indiana, are these words:

11th Mo. 29th [1821]. We came eight miles to a late breakfast in Hindostan a newly begun town of about twenty houses. Our road so

far, like that we travelled yesterday, was hilly and the country but thinly inhabited. We ferried the river, which we are told is four hundred yards [feet] in width; and after ascending a hill, had a fine level road, etc. On the second day we had an agreeable ride through the woods to Mt. Pleasant. On the third day we were at a small and newly settled meeting there.

Captain William Newnham Blaney, an English gentleman, visited the United States and Canada in 1822-23. From his report these extracts are taken:

At Greenville, a collection of straggling cabins, I stopped at a house kept by a Mr. Porter, a man from the New England states. This tavern, though small, was without exception the most clean and comfortable I had ever been in since I crossed the Alleghenies. Whenever indeed you stop at the house of a New Englander, you are certain to receive more attention, and to find everything cleaner and of a better quality, than in a tavern kept by a Southern or Western man. Before arriving at Hindostan, a small village on the east fork of White river, the country becomes very hilly; and, being on that account thinly settled, abounds with game of all descriptions.

In *The Western Sun and Advertiser*, May 23, 1818, and for several weeks thereafter, appeared an advertisement for the sale of town lots in the town of Greenwich, signed by William Harris, in which he announced the sale of lots, July 14, 1818. Among other things here is the write up:

This is one of the most eligible sites for a town in the forks of White river, and possesses several very important advantages; one of the most distinguished is the great site for water works, which appears calculated for mills to any extent, and will be partially improved this season, by the completion of a saw mill that was commenced last summer by Captain F. Sholts. The navigation of White river will also be of great improvement to this town; whenever the interior part of this state becomes thickly settled the merchant mills erected at these falls will undoubtedly be supplied with wheat for the New Orleans market, from a great distance up the river. The adjacent country is generally land of the second quality; a large portion of it tillable, and it will admit of a populous settlement. The main road from Kentucky through Louisville to Vincennes and St. Louis, and also the road from the state of Ohio to those places, crosses White river at Greenwich.

This form of advertisement was common in those days. Nearly all of them were in the superlative degree. On July 20, 1818, six days later, lots were sold at Portersville, the first county seat of Dubois county, situated on White river, about eleven miles below Greenwich. The advertisement for Portersville was also in promising colors.

The diary of Richard Lee Mason of Maryland, a soldier of the war of 1812, contains this item:

Friday, November 5, 1819. Traveled over an extremely mountainous country to White river (east fork), where a town was laid out last May. Promising little place. Several houses building, together with the industrious appearance of saw and grist mills, give it the appearance of a place of business. Little town is called Hindostan.

David Thomas, an American pomologist, florist, and writer on agricultural subjects, born in 1776, made a journey through this part of Indiana in 1816. In his journal as of July 4, 1816, he writes:

As the last gleamings of the day were departing, we arrived at Schult's, near the Driftwood branch of White river. This tavern is a recent establishment. The proprietor, formerly from Pennsylvania, but latterly from Seneca county, in New York, has adopted the eastern mode of clearing land, and at once lays it open to the day. The pleasantness of the prospect, the safety of the cattle, and the excellence of the crop, which now promises to exceed by one-half every other that we have seen in the country, will strongly recommend this method to his neighbors. Last evening we had heard the noise of the falls a distance of a mile or two over the hills, and on approaching, I found the water to pitch down about four feet over a level sand rock, extending straight across the river. The thick woods on the opposite shore, the clear sky, the smooth expanse of water, the foam of the cascade, and the unbroken quiet, formed one of the sweetest scenes of solitude. Avoiding the force of the stream, small fish in great numbers had come in close with the shore; and, eager to ascend the little currents from ledge to ledge, were so crowded together that I could take them up by handfuls.

The United States postoffice and post roads map of 1839, locates Hindostan and Mt. Pleasant, and shows that the mail carrier had to go to Hindostan, but crossed the river at Mt. Pleasant.

In the *Western Sun*, August 7, 1819, the postmaster general of the United States advertised for men to carry the mail from Louisville to Vincennes 130 miles, once a week, as follows:

From Louisville by Jeffersonville, Utica, Charlestown, Salem, Paoli, Shelby, Liverpool [Washington, Indiana] and Hawkin's Ferry to Vincennes.

This route would pass by Mt. Pleasant. The order bears date of May 26, 1819.

In the state library there is on file a letter written by J. Doane to John Tipton, Esqr., sheriff of Harrison county,

dated July 19, 1820. It is postmarked Hindostan, Ia., July 19. The postage was ten cents. A circular wooden or metal stamp was used in impressing the words "Hindostan, Ia." on the letter. John Tipton became General John Tipton, and a United States senator from Indiana.

At the second session of the fifteenth congress a post road was established from Princeton, by Columbia and Petersburg, and the seat of justice [Portersville] in Dubois county, to Paoli. At the same session a post road was also established from Jeffersonville to Vincennes, via Greenville, Fredericksburg, Paoli and Washington. (*Western Sun*, Saturday, July 31, 1819.) This last route evidently passed through Hindostan. In the Princeton-Paoli notice the seat of justice for Dubois county was identified by these words: "Dubois Court House" (being the McDonald fort in Dubois county).

On December 31, 1821, the General Assembly enacted a law, one section of which reads as follows:

Section 7. That the road from Rockport to Portersville, thence to Hindostan, thence to Bloomington, be and the same is established in length eighty miles; that the sum of five thousand four hundred and seventeen dollars be appropriated, and that Joseph D. Clements of Martin county, Michael Buskirk of Monroe and Sam Snyder of Spencer be appointed commissioners, etc.

A map published in 1834, by S. A. Mitchell, shows a road from Rockport to Mt. Pleasant by way of Jasper and Portersville.

In *Readings in Indiana History*, page 236, this appears:

In the days before bridges there were necessarily far more ferries than at present. Every county had licensed ferrymen. On the Louisville-Vincennes stage road there were two well-known ferries, one over Driftwood at Houghton's or Mount Pleasant, the other over White river at Maysville. The ferryman was usually a tavernkeeper as well.

General Washington Johnson, the first to enter land at Mt. Pleasant, was postmaster at Vincennes. He was commissioned to organize Dubois county, February, 1818. He was born in Virginia, in 1783, and was the first member of the Knox county bar. He was the "father of Masonry" in Indiana, being the prime mover in establishing Vincennes Lodge No. 1, F. & A. M., March, 1809. Johnson was a hero of Tippecanoe, and was promoted quartermaster from the ranks, October 30, 1811. He was auditor of public accounts,

adjutant general, treasurer of Indiana territory, etc. He served as state representative during the sixth, eleventh, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the General Assembly. Part of the time he was speaker of the house. In all he was a very active pioneer official and citizen. He died October 26, 1833.

General Johnson never forgot his dignity and aristocratic training. In his early days he always appended the word "gentleman" after signing his name. He had a colored slave named Mary Clark, who had bound herself to Johnson by an indenture dated October 24, 1816, to serve him for twenty years. After one of the hardest fought legal battles of pioneer days, she was discharged from her servitude. This was the death of slavery in Indiana, five years after the Constitution of 1816. Slaves were considered convenient, and for that reason they were called "voluntary servants" by an agreement with them in writing, in which they worked out their freedom. Their introduction was permitted by the territorial legislature previous to 1816. The Corydon constitution prohibited slavery forever in Indiana. Many well-to-do citizens about Vincennes had "voluntary servants." That was the "slave section" of Indiana; the Charlestown and Corydon sections opposed slavery.

General Johnson was a noted orator and lawyer of his day and generation. He could melt a jury into tears or bring it up to a state of frenzy. Perhaps the first effort to issue a law book of any kind in Indiana, at private expense, was made by General Johnson, in 1817. He called his work a *Compound of Acts*, 1807-1814. This volume is very rare now. One book would bring more today than Johnson received for his entire edition in 1817.

The Hon. Wm. E. Niblack of Vincennes began the practice of law at Mt. Pleasant in 1854. He was born at Portersville, May 22, 1822, was a surveyor, a lawyer, state representative, state senator, circuit judge, congressman, Democratic national committeeman and judge of the Supreme Court of Indiana. He died at Indianapolis, May 7, 1893.

The Dr. Porter mentioned (also on page 353 of *Wilson History of Dubois County*) was Dr. Ezekiel Porter of Porter's Retreat, three miles south of Mt. Pleasant and four miles west of Hindostan Falls. The "retreat" was in section twelve of

township two north, of range five west. The Porters came from Rutland, Vermont, staying for a time about Lexington, Kentucky. Dr. Porter's wife was Eunice G. Pomroy, but she died in Vermont, 1814. Dr. Porter had six children, namely, Laura G., Daniel Pomroy, James W., Julius R., Harriet E. and Caroline M. Laura G. Porter became the wife of Thomas G. Prentiss. Their daughter, Laura, became Mrs. John Van Trees of Washington, Indiana.

In 1872 Julius R. Porter lived at Greenville, Floyd county, Indiana, and Caroline M. (Porter) Grover lived at Lafayette, Indiana. The others had passed to the silent beyond previous to October 24, 1872.

Daniel P. Porter married Lydia Gould. James W. Porter was married twice. Julius R. Porter married Elizabeth Berry. Caroline M. Porter became Mrs. Grover. Harriet Porter remained single.

Dr. Ezekiel Porter died in Martin county; D. P. Porter at Greenville; James W. Porter at Cloverport, Kentucky; Laura G. Prentiss at Hindostan, and Harriet E. Porter at Greenville.

Portersville, in Dubois county, was named in honor of that member of the Porter family who was a relative of Judge Arthur Harbison of Dubois county.

Judge Jonathan Doty, often mentioned in connection with the pioneer court at Hindostan, was also the presiding judge at the first court held in Dubois county. He was born at Somerville, New Jersey, and was a graduate of Princeton. He died February 22, 1822, while in office.

Prior to 1820, a store or trading post was established at Hindostan, probably on Captain Kibley's road by Lewis Brooks, and from his store supplies for hunters, pioneers, etc., were taken down White river on boats to Portersville, the first "county town" of Dubois county. It was two miles from Portersville to the Buffalo trace, thus this plan connected the two forks of this road and furnished a connecting link in event of Indian trouble. Thomas J. Brooks conducted the store at Portersville. The tradition is that the Brooks's brought their goods "on east," i. e., Cincinnati. They were Yankees and came from Concord, Massachusetts. Hindostan failed during the pestilence in Indiana between 1820 and 1822. (*Indiana Historical Society Publications*, Vol. 6, pp. 353-5.)

In 1825 John Reily of Hindostan was an agent for the

Masonic Register, which was printed and published at Vevay, by Wm. C. Keen, R. A. M. (*Western Sun*).

In 1838 the General Assembly of Indiana appointed Wm. K. Jones of Spencer county, Willis Hayes of Dubois county and John Gwynn of Martin county as commissioners to lay out a state road from Rockport, by way of Gentryville and Jasper to Haysville, then by the nearest and best route to Mount Pleasant, in Martin county. (*Acts* 1837-8, p. 328.)

The Indiana legislature of 1843 appointed A. L. Bladgrave of Dubois county, Ezekiel Rutherford and Wm. B. Pine of Martin county, commissioners to view, mark and locate a state road from Haysville to Hindostan, by way of Pine's Mill.

On July 24, 1826, Dr. Lawrence S. Shuler, in a long letter, dated at Hindostan, announced himself as a candidate for congress. The letter appeared in the *Western Sun*, July 29, 1826. He was president of the Indiana Medical Society. He was a native of Montgomery county, New York, and died August 4, 1827, at Terre Haute, of consumption.

Joseph D. Clements used to advertise in the *Western Sun*, in 1826, that he had procured the art of curing persons troubled with stammering.

General John Tipton introduced the bill that took away part of Dubois county and attached it to Martin county. Fred Sholts was active in this movement. He also asked for a survey of the falls at Hindostan the same year.

In 1823 mail was carried from Palestine by way of Hindostan to Portersville, thence on to Corydon.

What is said to have been the first attempt to rob the mails in Indiana occurred a short distance from Hindostan on the night of March 15, 1830. The rider was struck with a club and injured, but his horses ran away. There were three ruffians in the gang. (*Indianapolis Gazette*, April 8, 1830, copied from the *Louisville Public Advertiser*.)

In the *Western Sun*, June 6, 1818, its readers were warned of the danger of exposure to smallpox, reported to have been brought west from New York and Philadelphia by emigrants, travelers, etc., who put up at taverns. Perhaps this was the source of the downfall of Hindostan. During 1819 many advertisements and communications appeared giving recipes

for the cure of smallpox, cholera morbus and yellow fever. Settlers came to Indiana by trails and streams. Keel boats were used in traveling up stream, thus in various ways sickness could have been brought into the early settlements. The cause of the sickness at Hindostan does not appear clear. Other settlements also suffered, but in a smaller way.

The story of Hindostan, Greenwich and Mt. Pleasant, now a century old, is worth a careful study on the part of the history students of southern Indiana and of Martin county in particular. All available data should be compiled and preserved. It is worth while. It is very gratifying to record that the data left by Mr. Brooks is in keeping with written and printed reports, many from England and of which he had no knowledge. His information came from other sources, mostly personal knowledge.

A Pioneer Wedding

Letter¹ from Catherine M. Noble Davidson² to Margaret A. Sullivan.³

Indianapolis May (June) 6th, '40.

My Dearest Friend

I perused your letter with a mixture of pleasure and pain. I was delighted to hear from the dearest girl to me on earth and was pained when I found that you were wounded at my sending an notice of my marriage with the *respects* of Mrs. A. H. Davidson, and that you imagined that as I was forming new *interests* that I had not still a place in my heart for you. I will tell you about the paper. I requested Mr. Davidson⁴ to get me a Journal containing a notice of our marriage, to send to you. he got it and wrote on it and addressed it to you with his own hand. he said with respects of Mrs. A. H. D. as much as fun, of seeing it written as for anything, else, and I know, he did not once think that *respects* would sound *cold* and *formal* and as I was dressing for *making* rather *returning* calls I did not write myself. Mag, *forget* this and feel assured that there is not another girl on the earth, for whom I entertain pure, disinterested, unmixed affection except yourself you Mag. Since you (I) have (been) away from you I have learned how (to) appreciate your excellent and amiable qualities. I am not flattering Not (a) day passes away that I do not remember you and am not reminded of some act or expression of kindness towards me. Mag I have to dwell on your character, *energy* is your prominent characteristick. In yourself are united two qualities which are irresistibile, the most accute sensitiveness, to joy or grief in your own person, and the most lively sympathy with the

¹ This letter was presented to the Indiana State Library by a granddaughter of Catherine Noble Davidson, Miss Valette Miller of Indianapolis. With her assistance and that of others who are related to the old families of Indianapolis, the identity of most of the persons mentioned in the letter has been ascertained. The wedding, described in the letter, took place in the old Noble homestead, which stood on Market street, near what is now Cruse street, Indianapolis.

ESTHER U. MCNITT, Indiana State Library.

² Daughter of Governor Noah Noble.

³ Daughter of Judge Jeremiah Sullivan.

⁴ Alexander H. Davidson, 1812-63, quartermaster-general of Indiana, 1839-44.

feelings of *others*. Mag excuse me but I can (not) refrain from pouring out the sentiment of my heart and soul in regard to yourself. I will now tell you about my wedding how I was attired for *the occasion*. On the 19th about 7-o'clock we were united hand and *heart* in the presence of nearly 200, hundred persons. I can not say in their *presence* for they had to stand in the front hall, and in the yard, and of course there were many that did not witness the ceremony. The candles were not lighted until afterwards. My dress was of White Satin very rich and thick dead white. The bosom made with folds across, with one row of shell trimming around the neck, two rows on the sleeves. The skirt *long without any trimming* deep blonde on the sleeves. My gloves white kid satin on the tops and edged with blonde. My hair was plaited behind and my Grecian curls were curled very beautifully and worn behind curls in front. Mock orange blossoms were sent to me to wear in my hair. I wore them in front buried in my curls and beautiful white rose in behind. My shoes were of *light kid* the(y) were *entirely white* at candle light. My pocket-kерchief was trimed with deep lace. Mrs Williams came in *the* room we were in before the gentlemen came and she offered me her *chain* and *watch* which I wore and completed my dress. E. Browning's⁵ dress was of some thin kind of goods of I do not know the name with a broad satin stripe and a vine in it and something between the stripes. It was very beautifull, looked like a blonde dress. M. Yandis⁶ dress was trimmed with satin on the skirts and on the bosoms likewise Jane Rings. They all looked well. pretty E. B. & Dr Bobbs⁷ went in first. (I mistake) O Neal⁸ & J. R. went in first, and stepped to the right of the place in the front parlour, Jane retaining O N's arm, and then E. B. & Dr B. went in next, and stood to the left near the folding doors, she still leaning on Dr B.'s arm. M. Y. and Hubbard⁹ went in and parted to make room for Mr

⁵ Elizabeth L. Browning, daughter of Edmund Browning. She later married Samuel V. B. Noel. Nowland, J. H. B., *Reminiscences of Indianapolis* (Indianapolis, 1870), p. 192.

⁶ Mary Yandes, daughter of Daniel Yandes of Indianapolis.

⁷ Dr. John S. Bobbs, 1809-70, a prominent surgeon of Indianapolis.

⁸ Probably Hugh O'Neal, who came to Indianapolis in 1821. Nowland, p. 112.

⁹ Probably William S. Hubbard, 1816-1907. He came to Indianapolis in 1837. Nowland, p. 331.

Davidson and *Catherine* who followed and stood between M. Y. and Hubbard *Catherine* still having D.'s arm, immediately in the front of the fire place. Imagine us thus arranged Mr Beecher¹⁰ in front of the semicircle, and a dozen upon the *sofa* chairs and pressing near to get a glimpse. I was calm, composed as one could be on any occasion. I felt Mr. Davidson's heart beat next to my arm. Now the prayer begins which is quite long *beautiful appropriate* (mutilated) it made (me) thrill, with emotions pleasure of the most peculiar character. Beecher knew all the circumstances of the former engagement, and he made a very delicate allusion to it. The ceremony was short. Mr Beecher kissed us both and said it was *done now* he was sick and was carried into a room to lie down. friends relations pressed forward to offer their congratulations. My attendants were the first to kiss me. When the door was thrown open for us to enter the parlour there was Duncan standing immediately in the view. Mag I ought perhaps not to mention Duncan's name but there are subjects I dare not touch *upon on paper at least*. wait till I see you. but I *digress* too often from the subject. Our supper was between eight and *nine* The bed was taken out of mother's room the tables were set one opposite the fire place and the(n) down the sides from the one, opposite the fireplace in the centre of the room between the tables was a small mahogany *candle stand*,¹¹ *round top* covered with a white cloth, bearing the Brides cake which was very splendid. a large pyramid was at the head of the table. We had elegant jelly cake and other kinds in fruit baskets and cut up in slices set in plates, *tea coffee* ice creams were sent around in the parlour afterward I have not told you how Mr D. was dressed. It was a rich suit of Broad cloth black satin vest, stock, *frock* coat, boots very handsome made for the express purpose, a pocket handkerchief that I gave him. his appearance was very fine looked extremely handsome very animated. his attendants were dressed in the same style. Well Mag I am as happy as mortal man can make me! I feel as if I had indeed, entered into a new state of being and that

¹⁰ Henry Ward Beecher, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Indianapolis, 1839-47. Dunn, J. P., *Greater Indianapolis* (Chic., 1910), I, p. 582.

¹¹ This table is now in the possession of Miss Valette Miller.

I had my part to perform in great theater of human life, as if a good deal was expected from me, and that I know, must begin to take my own stand in society and must depend upon myself. I wish you were in the same new existence and near me to begin the world with me. Mag, marry some person and come and live in Indianapolis. When you are engaged wont you let me know? I am invited to dine at Mr Beecher's today, and I am looking for Mr D. to come and go with me. We are going to a party tonight at James Morrison's¹² Alex Morrison¹³ has given one which we attended. There will be more parties given, which would have been given were it not for so many being gone to the Battle Ground.¹⁴ What glorious occasion the greatest political gathering ever known in our country. You have heard of the number estimated to have been present from 40,000 to 60,000. In the evening there was a most brilliant Borealis which was hailed with a shout as an omen of success to the whigs. There was great excitement on Monday as the different delegations passed through with their banners and flags, log cabins towards the Battle Ground. a great many persons went from this place, but no ladies. There has been incessant rains, which have prevented the ladies from this place from attending 600 Ladies from other parts were there. The day was fine for convention. Tom¹⁵ called up to see me the evening he arrived. I was much pleased to see him. Isabella Wick¹⁶ has returned and is, preparing to go to housekeeping, and will be ready this coming week. I called to see her. I thought she looked very thin. We had a great number of calls on the next day after our marriage, and someone has been out ever day since. last evening we had twelve calls, in the *afternoon* rather.

¹² Judge James Morrison, 1796-1869. He was secretary of state, 1829-33, and was the first attorney-general of Indiana. *Nowland*, p. 214.

¹³ Major Alexander F. Morrison, 1804-57. He was the first publisher of the *Indiana Democrat*. *Nowland*, p. 218.

¹⁴ A state convention was held May 29 by the Young Men Whigs at the Tippecanoe battle-ground, because of its historical connection with their candidate, William Henry Harrison. This Battle-Ground Convention was attended by many from other states and was full of the old-fashioned campaign enthusiasm. *Spirit of '76*, Indianapolis, June 6, 1840.

¹⁵ Probably Thomas L. Sullivan, son of Judge Jeremiah Sullivan.

¹⁶ Isabella Barbee Wick, whom Judge William W. Wick married in 1839. Woollen, W. W., *Biographical and Historical Sketches of Early Indiana*. Indianapolis, 1883, p. 260.

Parry has returned from the Baltimore Convention.¹⁷ did not (know) anything of Mr. D. and I, untill he got to Cincinnati and then he heard that I was married he was shocked and *could* not come to see me untill yesterday he did not call my name had very little to say, trembled like an aspen, voice faltered. I am delighted with those articles you presented me. The music is pretty very, been very much admired.

I must bring this to a close. Will trouble your self to read it? I have (not) looked (at) a word as I have written if you can read I will be glad. do write soon and I will (be) glad to hear from you often as you will write (mutilated) I will take just the same interest in you and your (mutilated) formerly. My feelings have not changed in regard to anything (illegible) young person's love. Don't mention when you write, either Duncan's or Parry's name. I will (not) show your letters to Mr D if you do not wish it I will (not) let him know anything that you might want to say to me alone.

Adeu dearest friend, Mag, I remain

still your friend Catherine M. N. Davidson

Mrs McClure left us evening before last for Madison on her way to Virginia she will visit Mrs. H.'s some time.*

Miss M. A. Sullivan,

Madison (Indiana)

¹⁷ A national convention of the Whig Young Men was held at Baltimore May 4. *Spirit of '76*, May 16, 1840.

*This letter was published in the March number of this magazine, while the editor was away. The printer and proofreader objected to the spelling and grammar and rewrote it as they thought it should be. ED.

The Pocket in Indiana History

By THOMAS JAMES DE LA HUNT

"What do you mean by 'The Pocket'?" is a question which residents of other states—or even elsewhere in our own commonwealth—frequently ask who dwell in its shelter. Be it mine, therefore, to answer this so far as possible within the time allotted me.

Were we in a geographical class-room, I should like to take a long pointer and trace upon our state map certain water-courses which form a logical natural boundary for Indiana's Pocket. Blue river, rising in Washington and Scott counties, flows into the Ohio a few miles above Leavenworth, leaving Harrison county to the east, and on its west bank let us take Crawford as the first county in The Pocket. Down the beautiful Ohio we shall go, passing in their order Perry, Spencer, Warrick, Vanderburg, until—at the extreme tip—Posey county is reached. Here, let us turn upward between the banks of the Wabash, follow it along, passing Gibson county, to the mouth of White river. Turning eastward here, coming next to Pike county, the river forks near Petersburg. Keeping with the east fork, this marks a part of Dubois county's northern line and at length we come to the lofty hills of Orange county. These constitute the natural watershed, since on their further slope the flow is toward Blue river, our point of commencement.

How many of you remember that the first battle on Indiana soil during the War Between the States occurred at the mouth of this Blue river, in Crawford county, June 19, 1863? A mere skirmish, you may say, yet out of sixty-two Confederates engaged, three were killed, two drowned, three

*This address was delivered at the conference of Indiana Pioneers and other historical societies at the Claypool Hotel, in Indianapolis, December 11, 1919. I solicited it for publication in the *Indiana Magazine of History* and I have urged its insertion over the modest demurrer of the Editor in Chief, whose name and ancestry are properly recognized in the address. The responsibility for publishing the article is mine; its merits belong to Mr. de la Hunt, to whom also should be given due honor and recognition in connection with this address for his very excellent history of Perry county, one of the best county histories produced in Indiana. That history is a worthy part of the story of the Pocket of Indiana.

JAMES A. WOODBURN

wounded, and fifty were captured by home guards under command of Captain Jesse C. Esarey of Perry county, and Major Robert E. Clendennin of Orange county. The Confederate captain, Thomas Hines, made his escape by swimming to Kentucky, where he rejoined Gen. John Morgan and, a fortnight later, participated in the Raid, (of which so much more is commonly heard,) and the Battle of Corydon.

Two days earlier, when Captain Hines had landed in Perry county, near Rome, on June 17, was the first time that any confederate troops had ever ventured to cross Mason & Dixon's line. John W. Minor, now a citizen of Indianapolis, was then a Perry county school-boy and was threatened by Hines for loyally refusing to aid in the horse-stealing plans of this daredevil expedition.

Captain Esarey's grandfather was one of Perry county's pioneers who, in 1810, had come into the state at the mouth of Little Blue river, twelve miles farther down. The family name has never died out thereabouts, though its present historical prominence attaches more to a scholarly representative in the faculty of Indiana University.

Furthermore, the solitary instance when naval cannon was discharged in defense of Indiana occurred in a Perry county harbour, July 25, 1864. The gunboat Springfield (No. 22 of the Mississippi River fleet) had been stationed at Cannelton for protection of its cotton manufactory, and twelve bombs were fired into the opposite village of Hawesville, to drive out a band of guerillas believed to be threatening an attack. The officer in command, Capt. Edmond Morgan, was an Englishman, formerly of the Royal artillery, and a cousin of Lord Lyons, then British ambassador. His widow still lives in Kokomo.

In thus dwelling on my own county I must take pains to allay with some cold drops of modesty my skipping spirit, yet Perry has no short history. Mound-builders' remains once perceptible have been obliterated by agriculture. A curious artificial formation of rock, called Troxell's Horse-Shoe, and attributed to the river-pirate Troxell, cannot now be authenticated.

Leopold, near the centre of the county, is an old Belgian community, founded through Father Augustus Bessonies,

long revered as Vicar-General of the Roman Catholic diocese of Vincennes (Indianapolis). While a young seminarian at Sainte Sulpice he heard a sermon preached by Bishop de la Hailandiere, and was fired by zeal to come over and begin a mission among the "Indians" of Indiana. Siberia is a hamlet of Russian farmers and Tell City's name signifies its birth as an original colony of freedom-loving Switzers, who would not plant their proposed town in any slave-holding state.

Yet we are not a county of foreigners. Eight Revolutionary graves have been accurately located in Perry county, besides those of others who fought in the War of 1812. The county's very name is one of the earliest memorials to the fame of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, bestowed on its organization, September 7, 1814, less than a year after the victory on Lake Erie. Many Perry county names are on the roster of those who fought in Indian skirmishes or at Tippecanoe under William Henry Harrison,—the governor, the general, the president.

Like so many statesmen of his day, Harrison had an exaggerated reverence for the classics. Jacob Piatt Dunn tells us that even in his official documents: "if Leonidas, Epaminondas and Lysurgus escaped; Cincinnatus, Scipio and the Gracchi were sure to be taken in his net." Thus it is a quaint commentary on this period that Perry county's pioneer towns received the storied names of Troy and Rome.

Troy, the oldest river settlement below the Falls, yet waits a Hoosier Homer to sing its long Iliad. Founded by Virginians who landed from a flatboat—according to tradition—while an Indian hunting-feast was in progress, and decided to remain with their families and negro slaves, it was an important landing and shipping-point for many years. The first western steamboat, New Orleans, touched at Troy in 1811. Her captain, Nicholas J. Roosevelt, took on some coal for fuel and purchased a tract of some 1,000 acres of coal land later sold to Robert Fulton, the inventor, whose brother, Abraham Smythe Fulton, was accidentally killed at a logging at Troy while beginning its development.

A still greater name associated with Troy, that of Abraham Lincoln, who in 1817 accompanied his father and mother to Perry county, and who during young manhood acted as

ferryman over the waters of Anderson creek. Across the Ohio river, too, as his first case in any court was pleading his own defense in the opposite Kentucky county for inadvertent violation of another's ferry license privilege, through his willingness to oblige a hurrying traveler.

Re-adjustment of boundary lines placed Thomas Lincoln's land-entry in another county within a year after he settled in Indiana, but he and his family came often to Troy, as the nearest river town, and were residents of the same neighboring countryside until their removal to Illinois in 1827.

Two years earlier, accidental circumstances brought as a guest to Perry county, on May 9, 1825, the most distinguished foreigner who ever trod the soil of Indiana, Gilbert Motier de Lafayette, in his farewell triumphal visit to America as the nation's guest, an honor without parallel in history. When en route from Nashville to Louisville, his steamer, the "Mechanic" struck upon Rock Island (then covered by high water), five miles east of Cannelton, and went to the bottom in ten minutes. Passengers and crew were saved and had to spend the remainder of the night ashore, only the general and Governor Carroll, of Tennessee, having the luxury of a bed in the cabin of a pioneer, James Cavender. It stood near a spring that spouts from a tall cliff and next morning, before resuming his journey on another boat, Lafayette here received and welcomed many Perry county farmers and their families who hastily gathered to pay their tribute of respect.

All these facts have been verified and the spring is now known as "Lafayette Spring". Its formal dedication was held on the general's 159th birthday, kept as Lafayette Day in Perry county's centennial week. Dr. Logan Esarey was orator of the day, by invitation of the Cannelton and Tobinsport club women, who had taken the spot in their charge. They are now planning its further beautification as a tiny unit in Indiana's state park system, as it lies on a fine riverside turnpike constantly visited by motor tourists. Two years later, the name "Lafayette School" was officially conferred on the district school nearby.

Crossing Anderson creek into Spencer county, the pervasive memory of Lincoln asserts itself in the village of Lincoln city, near the center of the county, where the martyred

president spent ten years of boyhood. Nancy Hanks Lincoln Memorial Park is a charming tract of woodland surrounding the long-unmarked grave of Abraham's "angel mother." It has a large pavilion-like auditorium of permanent construction, where public assemblies are often held. The suggestion has been made that Spencer county should hold here at stated intervals a Lincoln Pageant, that the rising generations might see again some episodes of the great man's story. The magnificent county pageant at Rockport in 1916, written by a daughter of Spencer county, the brilliant Kate Milner Rabb, now of Indianapolis, had Lincoln scenes well worthy frequent reproduction.

In Little Pigeon cemetery, a mile or two away, lies the grave of Abraham's only sister, Sarah Lincoln Grigsby, with a tombstone erected in 1916, and the site of Thomas Lincoln's cabin—now in the village schoolyard—is indicated by an inscribed marker of marble.

Chief credit for this is due the late Helen Morgan Baumgaertner, probably the one person who knew the most concerning the history of her native county. A Daughter of the American Revolution, she was a lineal descendant of Captain Spier Spencer, who laid down his life in command of his "Yellow Jackets" at Tippecanoe, and the county commemorating his name was dear to his great-granddaughter. Mrs. Baumgaertner had accumulated much valuable material toward writing a history of Spencer county and the interruption of this purpose is one of the deplorable circumstances of her untimely death.

Hastening on; the next county's name, Warrick, is a further reminder of Tippecanoe and another captain who was killed there, Jacob Warrick. Organized in 1813, this county was originally "The Pocket" itself, extending from Harrison to Gibson, and thus has a claim on events now classified under other heads. Evansville was the first county seat, later changed to Darlington but in a few years removed to Boonville, named for the pioneer, Ratliff Boon (not Daniel Boone), who was afterward lieutenant-governor. Boonville was a station on the mail route established in 1812 between New Harmony and Louisville, and it is recorded that the first carrier, John Williams, required two weeks to make the round

trip on horseback. Often horse and rider had to swim creeks or ponds they could not go around, and the mail-bags with their contents were so completely water-soaked that much time and care were required to dry them out.

Henry Vanderburg, a captain in the American Revolution, a member of the legislative council of the Northwest territory; a judge of the first court formed in Indiana territory, is honored in the name of the Pocket's wealthiest, most populous county.

In 1812 one Colonel Hugh McGary crossed from Kentucky and landing, tied his canoe to an historic elm-tree near the foot of what is now Division street in Evansville. An Indian village of Shawnees then lay between him and Pigeon creek, we are told, but was not dangerously troublesome.

McGary laid out some few lots, but the real beginning of the city was made by Gen. Robert M. Evans' purchase and survey of a town-site in 1816-17. Evansville's early years show comparatively little of romance. Its growth has been steady, however, toward marked commercial prosperity as Indiana's natural gateway to the south. To the state as governor Evansville gave Conrad Baker; to international diplomacy, John W. Foster and Charles Denby; to American literature, the gifted sisters, Annie Fellows Johnston and Albion Fellows Bacon.

Posey county, named on organization in 1814 for Gen. Thomas Posey, is beyond doubt the most universally known of all the Pocket counties, through the prominence of New Harmony. So much has been written in detail touching this absolutely unique village, that it is needless to repeat facts that are familiar to everyone in Indiana. The Rappite colonists; the Owen community; the Fauntleroy home, birthplace of the renowned "Minerva," September 20, 1859, and a Mecca for all American club women; each offers a theme on which countless pens have dwelt. "Of making many books there is no end"—on New Harmony. It is a shrine too sacred for desultory handling near the close of a paper already long.

It can only be noted further that Posey county furnished one of Indiana's most important governors, Alvin P. Hovey, a native of Mount Vernon, who had previously been a jurist, a dashing brigadier-general, a polished envoy-extraordinary.

Gibson county is a reminder of Gen. John Gibson. In his youth he had been captured and held by the Indians, so could speak their language fluently and to him was addressed that celebrated speech of the Mingo chief, "Logan," so long a classic in schoolroom readers of past generations. A fierce massacre in 1815, between Princeton and the Wabash River, cost the lives of nine white settlers and was a stirring early event. Along more peaceful lines, Princeton claims the first regular Sunday school in the Pocket, organized in 1820 by the Covenanters (now United Presbyterians).

The fine historical writings of Colonel Cockrum, of Oakland City, give a detailed account of the "Underground Railway," a movement perhaps peculiar to Gibson among the Pocket counties, as a pro-slavery sentiment was distinctly evident among some of the river counties during the first six decades of the last century, especially among the Scotch Covenanters, most of whom had come from the south.

Pike county, rich in underlying minerals and once heavily timbered, has much fertile acreage and its history appears for the most part a placid chronicle, though "forts" were built for protection against the red men and one of the last remaining "block-houses" was torn down only a short time ago. It is interesting to recall that cotton was once grown in the sheltered Patoka valleys and the pioneer industry had reached such proportions by 1818 that James McEwen erected a commercial cotton-gin, which took its place among primitive distilleries, grist and saw mills.

Dubois county history has had a capable historian in the person of a native of Perry county, George Robert Wilson, of Jasper and Indianapolis. His published volume gives a comprehensive resumé of what transpired in his adopted county from its settlement by the McDonalds in 1801 down to 1904 when the book appeared. One of its most valuable chapters is the biography of Toussaint Dubois, for whom the county was named, one of Harrison's spies and guides at Tippecanoe. The varied foreign elements making up the county's population afford interesting material which Mr. Wilson has ably handled. Several of the more important spots have been suitably marked through his generous enthusiasm and the co-operation of Miss Genevieve MacDonald Williams, of

Huntingburg, the county centennial chairman, and the author and director of the fine pageants presented at Huntingburg in 1916.

Though cotton once flourished in Pike and Dubois counties, it is not claimed that oranges ever grew among the hills of Orange county, unless in modern hotel corridors of French Lick or West Baden. The name was chosen to commemorate Orange county, North Carolina, whence came many of its early settlers, members of the society of friends. Among pioneer names handed down are Clendennin, Lindley, Trueblood, Braxton, Chambers and Darroch; this last that of the earliest teacher (Duncan Darroch), who taught in 1812. A year before this, the first church edifice had been built by the Quakers.

To southern blood and affiliations such as existed nearer the Ohio may be traced the Confederate sympathy that was outspoken among some Orange county residents, and was secretly fostered by the Knights of the Golden Circle, known to have their headquarters at Paoli. Dr. W. A. Bowles, who had been twice a member of the legislature and a colonel in the Mexican war, was an unquestioned leader in this movement. Before a military court in Indianapolis he was found guilty of treason and sentenced to death in 1864, a penalty, however, which was reversed by the supreme court, releasing him.

Yet Orange county was not disloyal; was not the hot-bed of Bitternuts and Copperheads as a whole. It was Paoli's sixty armed minute-men, under a Clendennin, who marched to join an Esarey at Blue river for the repulse of Hines at Blue river.

In a word, as Maurice Thompson, of southern lineage and Confederate service, has written, "Indiana men might wrangle and squabble among themselves; might call each other hard names in the heat of local politics; yet when it came to choosing between the Union and Secession, all stood together for the old Flag and the Constitution."

My pocketful of Indiana history is thus emptied near the place of its beginning. In conclusion I would turn it inside out to show once more its silver lining the Ohio river, that marvelous Course of Empire, a stream of matchless beauty,

with a history of imperishable significance. Beauty is its own excuse for being and it is the "Beautiful River" that we love best in the Pocket; we whose ancestors traversed its long shining aisle through a fair green world, under the sun and stars of a century and a quarter ago.

Reaching high into the foothills of the Alleghenies and the Cumberlands; beckoning to the intrepid colonists of Virginia and the Carolinas, with outspread arms reaching as far as the sources of the Allegheny at the north and those of the Tennessee at the south; the Beautiful river called through the forest stillness with musical voice, then heard by the pioneers of the Pocket and yet echoing in the hearts of their sons and daughters.

Men may come, and men may go, still the Beautiful river listens to the story of to-day that shall some time be the history of yesterday.

The History of Madison

BY THE WOMEN'S CLUB OF MADISON

Madison is one of the oldest cities in the state, surpassed in age, probably, by but three, and only one of these, Vincennes, by but a very few years, and by none in beauty of location.

Madison was practically one hundred years old last spring (1908), and the first white man's cabin having been erected near where the present pumping house of our water works stands, in the spring of 1808 by Mr. William Hall, who squatted on the land then belonging to the United States. He sold his cabin the following year to Jonathan Lyon, one of the three men who in 1810 laid out the town. The other two were John Paul, who bought the land the city is now built on, of the government in 1809 and Lewis Davis, who came here with Paul.

Shortly after Hall had built his cabin, and before he sold it to Lyon, John K. Wagner, the father of Isaac Wagner, later mayor of the city, came here and built a cabin on what was then a high bank on the northeast corner of Mulberry and First streets. These, both built in 1808, were the first houses built in the bottom here, the early residents, the Vawters and others who came from Kentucky and other states, having either purchased or squatted on land on top of the hill.

As stated, the town was laid out by the three proprietors named, in 1810, and the first sale of lots was made the year afterward, 1811.

From this time on, Madison seems to have had a rapid growth, for a new country. Many persons came over from Kentucky and others coming down the Ohio, then the great highway through this country, and noting the beauty of the location and the splendid timber land surrounding, stopped here.

The first store there is any record of in the town was kept by Col. John Vawter, who came here in 1808 with his father, Elder Jesse Vawter, locating on the hill. His place of business was on the southeast corner of Main and Jeffer-

son street, just west of and opposite the court-house. Another of the early merchants was John Sering, who came in the year 1810, and was made county treasurer in 1812. He was appointed the first postmaster and held the office for many years. He kept a store on the northeast corner of Main and Jefferson streets, where the Gertz bakery now is. At a later date, Mr. Sering established the first cotton mill in Madison. It stood on the ground now occupied by the residence of the late James J. Sering, on North Jefferson street. It had only machinery for making cotton yarn. This was made from cotton rolls or batting and was an industry of very nearly as great importance in that day as are the great cotton mills of our day, when the raw cotton is made into clothes of different grades by machinery. At that time the majority of all the clothes were made by the women from the raw material, whether flax, cotton or wool, carding by hand, spinning the thread and then weaving on a hand loom.

The town of Madison was incorporated by special act of the legislature April 15, 1824. The city of Madison was incorporated in 1838 by act of the legislature. The first mayor was Moody Park, serving from 1838 to 1850.

The city has always had excellent schools, from the time they were started, and today they are unexcelled in the state.

The first account of the improvements of the town of Madison is in a sketch by Mr. D. Blackmore, in 1850. He says:

Hall's was the first improvement. (This was in what is now called Fulton.) Then John B. Wagner's. Lyon made the third improvement on the high ground, called Scott's Garden, between the Ross tanyard and the river. In 1811, besides the improvements above, there were Trotter's, on High, near Walnut; Booth's Tavern, on Main (now Jefferson) and Second, southeast corner; Taylor's (father of Bushrod Taylor) saddle shop; J. Wilkinson's cabin, Walnut and High, east of Trotter's, and Nat Hunt's old residence.

From that time forward there has been a constant advance in buildings, principally of brick and very substantially built, have a great many of them long survived the builders and some are now standing, nearly one hundred years of age and quite strong and substantial.

The one great calamity of the town happened in 1846, early in September. A cloud burst occurred at the head of

Crooked creek and the raging waters came rushing down the creek, drowning eleven people and damaging property to the extent of \$100,000 in value. Fortunately, the flood was in daylight. The creek then flowed through a culvert under the railroad, much smaller than the present culvert. Floating houses came down the creek and stopped up the culvert. As a result, the whole bottom was flooded.

Madison was a place of much note at the early part of the last century. To it was attracted a very great number of people of all classes, characters and occupations. In 1816 and up to 1850, it was one of the points of attraction as a new and growing town, in a new and growing country. There were speculations in town lots and in all other possibilities of fortune making. It had its great boom, and property was up to fabulous prices. The capitalist was attracted to it as a place of investment; the mechanic as a place where he could get work, the merchant as a good opening for business and as a growing place; the lawyer and the doctor were attracted to it as furnishing a good opportunity for fame and riches; and it was especially attractive to the young men of that day. The beauty of the location and the natural surroundings was added to all the others which have been enumerated. All of these combining caused an inflow of men of mark on account of talent and ability, such as but few other places of that day or since have had. In the first fifty years of the century, but few of the men of prominence in this country, and foreigners traveling for instruction or pleasure but made Madison a point of visit. Many men who were afterwards of national fame were citizens of the old town. The bar of our city in those days stood head and shoulders above any other in this state, and was the peer of any in the country. In legal attainments as counsellors and advocates, none surpassed its members.

In the political arena, Madison has produced many names of honor and worth, both of state and national fame. William Hendricks, the first member of congress from this state, second governor of this state and United States senator for twelve years; Jesse D. Bright, who was lieutenant-governor of the state, United States senator for about sixteen years

(and for four years of that time president of the senate), and others for a mention of whom space is wanting.

During the forties, Madison was the only city in the west with a railroad. Our road had not extended even beyond Columbus in 1844 and no other road had been completed or scarcely begun. Our road was not completed until three years later, in 1847, though it was begun in 1836, practically 1835. We had the Michigan road, through to the Great Lakes, and the various roads built by the state spreading out in different directions. Madison was situated on the crown of a horse-shoe bend, bringing water craft far into the interior of the state, and from the south and east were easily sent over the railroad or over the various state roads into the interior, to our capital, then but a village, and to every interior point much easier and cheaper than from any other point of supply. And in return all the products of the great interior of the growing state drifted by natural law to Madison, to be sent onward to the various parts of the world by water, then our only means of transportation, save the ox cart or the horse or mule team. Even the canals had not been fully completed then though they were working on them. In other words, Madison held a monopoly on the transportation situation.

Madison was the greatest porkopolis in the world at that date, Chicago having not yet stolen her franchise on this great industry of the west, as it was preeminently a western enterprise. Hogs were sent here by the carload and wagon load, aye, by the hundreds of wagon loads and hundreds of thousands of hogs arrived here on foot, having traveled hundreds of miles from Illinois and surrounding states.

This is no idle story. When a small boy in the wilds of Illinois, where our hogs ran wild the year around, living and fattening on the mast, that is the acorns in the forests, I have helped gather up those belonging to my father, and with the assistance of the drover, took them to a nearby farmer's field or large pen. Here the hogs from all neighborhoods for twenty-five miles around were gathered until the drove was large enough to start on to Madison with. And then weeks were consumed en route ere the sore-footed swine arrived at the end of their journey, the slaughtering pen in Madison.

The earliest inhabitants had their grinding done at Mount Byrd, Kentucky. The first mill known in this part of the county was Col. John Paul's, built on Crooked creek, at the head of Mill street, in this city. The exact date of erection is not known, but it is mentioned as early as 1814. It was run by water power. When the contractors straightened Crooked Creek recently, they dug up the old stone wall, supposed by some to have been the foundation of the Paul mill.

In early times, many, in fact most, of the farmers took their corn and wheat to Trimble county, across the river, to have it ground. Later they built several horse and water mills in this county. When a boy, I have taken my father's grist to them and had it ground. The mill was simply a log building or shed; the machinery, a pair of mill stones set up in the middle of the building and operated by a long sweep, to which one or more horses were attached, walking around the mill. Over the stones was a rudely constructed hopper into which the corn or wheat was poured, falling onto the stones as the operation of grinding proceeded. Farmers would come to the mill with their sacks of corn or wheat, usually the former, on their horse. Arriving at the mill, they would hitch their horse to the sweep, the miller would take the sack of wheat or corn, and first taking his toll, so much for each bushel to be ground, put the remainder in the hopper, where it was reduced to meal or flour as the case might be. The farmer would then unhitch his horse, put his grist on its back, climb on himself and proceed on his way home, allowing the next to take his place at the mill.

The first mention of the woolen industry is that of Rev. William Robinson, a Presbyterian minister. Next was John N. Watson, then Braxton Wilson. Then came the carding rooms of Mr. Shuh, where steam power was used. Whitney and Hendricks followed and after a long interval was the Schofield-Hague (Haigh?) mills at the foot of Central avenue, where the Globe Tobacco works now stand. Some time after, the Schofield mills, northeast corner of First and Jefferson, and last the Louisville and Madison Woolen Mill, at the corner of West and Second streets, now idle. The Eagle Cotton mill, now owned by Richard Johnson, was moved here from Pittsburgh in 1884. Later, Mr. Johnson built the Madi-

son Cordage mill, the two mills employing from 300 to 400 hands.

Madison was also well provided with newspapers in early days. The second paper published in the state was published here, *The Western Eagle*, published by William Hendricks in 1813. Hendricks was afterwards governor. His home stood where the fine residences of Graham, Colgate and Vail now stand on First street. It was torn down a few years ago. His tomb stood on the hill near the "Old Camp Ground."

The first ship yard of the town was operated by Howard and Emerson, established in the decade of the thirties, situated at the extreme upper point of the town. The Madison Marine Railway shipyard was established in 1850 and has been in operation ever since. A yard was operated and boats built about where Thomas's cooper shop now stands, in the east end, as early as 1835, and was continued on until the present yard was built. Captain Barimore, who recently owned our present yard, worked there as a boy.

The first foundry here was carried on by Edward Shield & Brothers, located on northwest corner of High and Vine streets. The motive power was one hired horse. It was on the site of the present McKim-Cochran furniture factory. At one time Madison boasted of one of the largest foundries in the whole west, run under the firm name of J. S. and R. B. Neal. In 1850, Davidson & Crawford started the Indiana Foundry, now called the Madison Machine works. The Novelty works was established by J. N. Todd on Second street, near Elm, afterwards Walker's foundry, and removed to West street, where Charles R. Johnson now operates it.

The first starch factory of any size established in the West, was at Madison by O'Neal Bailey, an Irishman. This was a failure in his hands, but was finally a success under the management of Johnson and Clements. Finally they separated their interest and each built works at the west end of the city and were for many years the largest starch manufacturers in the whole country. They used daily about 1,800 bushels of corn in the manufacture of starch.

The first stove foundry was established in the 50's. The Madison stove foundry was established in 1884 and is now doing a good business.

Peter Crosby built a saw mill on the river front afterwards owned by Dow and Brown. It has burned since and Johnson rebuilt it on the same site. D. C. Robinson had a saw mill also on the river front which is now a handle factory, run by Columbus people.

The courthouse at that time was a two-story brick structure, much smaller than the present fine and commodious edifice. It stood where the present courthouse stands, perhaps a little farther towards Main street, as old Mr. Right Rea, father of the late R. R. Rea, owned the south half of the present courtyard and had a hotel on the alley facing Jefferson street. In later years he sold the lot to the county and the old hotel disappeared forever. The market house stood in the middle of Jefferson street, facing Main street and south of Main street. It was afterwards moved to the present site on Main and Walnut streets.

The old jail stood where the present structure is, but facing the alley end. The clerk's office, a one-story brick, stood on the northeast corner of the lot fronting on Main street, or as it was then called, Main Cross street. At the corner of Main and Jefferson streets was a two story building with a balcony around the second story facing both Main and Jefferson streets, and with a stairway outside leading to this balcony and the upper story. Down stairs was occupied by a dry goods store and a doctor's office. Dr. Joseph Rogers, the grandfather of Mr. William Rogers, of the Rogers' drug store, a big portly man, occupied this office. The second story was occupied by the county officers.

CHURCHES

Many good things have come to Madison and Jefferson county from its near neighbor, Kentucky, and notable among them was a supply of pioneer preachers, and after having breathed the free air of Indiana, they never went back. Without these noble men, this part of the Northwest territory would have much longer remained unconsecrated ground.

BAPTIST

Between the years 1781 and 1851, Indiana was considered a missionary field, so few and far between were the churches. As many as sixty-three protestant missionaries were labor-

ing here at one time among the settlers and we know from historical accounts that the Jesuit missionaries had long been in this wilderness striving with the red men. One historian claims that the religious development of Indiana came from without rather than from within. That may have been true of some counties, but it hardly seems so of Jefferson county, for we read that as soon as log cabins were built, there was erected a family altar and around that altar gathered any who might be living near, to pay homage to Him who had preserved them and given them the blessings of life.

In Jefferson county, there are ten townships: Lancaster, Monroe, Shelby, Graham, Smyrna, Madison, Milton, Hanover, Republican and Saluda. Madison township was the first one in which a church was organized and that church was of the Baptist denomination.

The founder of this church was Jesse Vawter, a Virginian by birth, born in Culpepper county in 1755. His parents were David and Mary Vawter and they, being Episcopalians brought their infant child and consecrated him in baptism by the form of sprinkling in the Episcopal church in Rapidan, Virginia. When he became a young man, he went to another part of the state to find work at his trade as carpenter and joiner and while there, he heard a sermon by a Baptist preacher that had such a wonderful effect upon him that he presented himself for baptism by immersion and joined the Baptist church. Soon after he met the woman of his choice, was married and moved to North Carolina.

In the story of his life, he says "Having lost all hope of ever having a Baptist church near me in North Carolina, I determined to move to Great Crossing, Scott county, Kentucky." So he and his wife and two children struck the trail that led to Great Crossing, Kentucky, and what was better than all, a Baptist church. Here he purchased land, established a home and became a man of influence. In 1800 a great revival spread over Kentucky, and under its spell Jesse Vawter felt called to preach the gospel. Whether he had received any special training for the work we do not know, but probably he was given some theological education between the time of his decision and his ordination which was five years.

There was a custom in those days of "trying out" the candidate for the ministry. He was given a certain time and place for "exercising his gifts" and if approved by his listeners, he was allowed to continue preaching, and if not, he was quietly told his services were not needed. Jesse Vawter gave satisfaction, proceeded on his ministerial course, and Dr. Stott, in his *Indiana Baptist History* says "Jesse Vawter's qualifications were far above mediocrity."

Land titles in those days were often not worth the paper on which they were written. So it proved with Jesse Vawter's purchase in Kentucky. He decided to move across the Ohio river and locate in Indiana territory. This was in the year 1806.

Jesse Vawter's name is worthy of a place among the pilgrims, for he too was of the mind that "church building was coeval with town building." As soon as he had a roof over his head, he invited what few neighbors he had to assemble in his house for religious worship regularly every Sunday. These were the families of Philemon Vawter, brother of Jesse, and a Baptist preacher also, of Jesse's two sons, and of the Edwards, Underwoods and Jacksons. The following year a church was organized and was built on the banks of Crooked creek and this was the first church of any kind in Jefferson county, and the second in Indiana territory bordering on the Ohio river, there being one not far from Louisville on the Indiana shore.

Not long after, the location of the church was changed from Crooked creek to the hilltop, near Jesse Vawter's home. Pleased with his surroundings, he named his home Mount Glad, and the church was called Mount Pleasant. His home was the place now occupied by Dr. and Mrs. William R. Davidson. Elder Vawter was retained as pastor as long as he lived, over twenty years.

We call this a day of conventions. Every society and profession meet in convention. In those early days the Baptists were fully organized and met in what they called associations. A certain number of churches formed an association and so fast did they multiply that soon they had to be divided. And after many divisions and sub-divisions, we

find Mt. Pleasant church in the Madison association, which was designated in this manner:

All churches east of the State Road (which was the Wirt Road), running from Madison to Indianapolis, shall be called the Madison Association. The object of the association shall be to extend our Christian union, fellowship and acquaintance with each other and to proclaim the good news of the salvation to the children of men.

This association was formed in 1833.

The Baptists numbered among their membership in Madison, so many of the colored population that a church was organized by them in 1849, called St. Paul's Second Baptist church. This association was organized in 1858.

It has not always been smooth sailing in Baptist waters. The cause of foreign missions almost rent them in twain. Some felt they must send the glad tidings to heathen lands while others were bitterly opposed to it. At one time there were so many different banners under which they sailed it must have been confusing. There were the Regular, Separate, United, General, Particular, Primitive, Freewill, Seventh Day and perhaps more. They differed only in minor forms, all holding to the same cardinal beliefs. None of these discordances moved the tranquil Jesse Vawter. He continued to preach as he was taught and to ply his trade, as the salary in those days might be something or nothing according to the needs of the preacher. The Mount Pleasant congregation came down from the hill-top to the town of Madison in 1831. Some have questioned why Madison did not go up to Mount Pleasant church and build the town around it, above the fog of the valley? Be that as it may, the Baptists erected a brick church on what is now called Vine street and grew in strength and influence. Dr. Stott says:

The Madison Baptist church was looked upon as a paradise to the preacher. The early Baptist churches of Jefferson county were organized as follows: Mt. Pleasant, in 1807; Indian Kentucky, in 1814; Middle Fork, in 1817, now dissolved; Herbert's Creek, in 1818; North Madison, in 1819; Milton, in 1828, now dissolved; Hebron, in 1828; Brushy Fork, in 1829; Ryker's Ridge, in 1841; Dupont, in 1849; Big Creek, in 1853, now dissolved; College Hill, in 1861.

Elder Jesse Vawter was called to his reward in 1838, at the ripe age of 83 years, and he is buried in the Wirt graveyard.

Among the preachers of that day were Revs. Vawter, Stott, Edwards, Owen, George, Stevenson, Craven, Monroe and others.¹

METHODIST

Soon after the sale of public lands in Indiana territory, came Methodism. This section of country was assigned to the Lawrenceburg circuit which belonged to the Western conference, and this conference was almost without limits. As the country became more thickly settled, the churches, in 1812, were assigned to the Ohio conference, a little nearer home. Now that we are among the Methodists, we must be prepared for rapid transit, for as Rev. W. W. Snyder of blessed memory said: "To move or not to move was the great issue," and he might have soliloquized further if he had been the least bit dissatisfied with his church's rulings and said "Whether 'tis nobler to suffer this move every two or four years or take arms against the Bishop and presiding elders?" But Brother Snyder did not feel that way. The mention of all the methodist ministers of that early day would be impossible for their name is legion. Among the founders of the Methodist church in Madison were Mr. and Mrs. Frame, George Burton and Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Gale. Walter Griffith was the first circuit rider to visit this locality. The first service was held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Gale. William Hughes was chosen as class leader. The Methodists began to grow as fast as the town did and soon they found a private house too small, so the courthouse was made use of and the preachers of that day were Whitson, Chitwood, Strange, Sharp, Oglesby and Sparks. There are conflicting records about these first gatherings of Methodists for worship. Mr. R. J. Hulburt 'in his "Sketch of Methodism in Madison" says that the first preaching place was in the McIntyre home on the corner of East and Second streets and this was in 1814-16. Mr. Snyder's account antedates that by two years, making the first service in 1812 at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Gale.

¹I am indebted to Dr. Stott's *Indiana Baptist History* and sermons by Dr. C. E. W. Dobbs, and also to newspaper articles.

Dr. Oglesby belonged to the medical profession, but he was given an appointment as preacher also and labored in this conference for ten or twelve years. Judge Sparks also had a two-fold occupation and could draw as large a crowd into the courthouse to hear him preach as to plead at the bar.

At this time in the history of Madison, East street was the eastern boundary of the town and West street the western boundary. Mr. Hulburt says that it was in 1816 or 1819 (although Mr. Snyder gave it in 1812-13), that the site for a Methodist church was chosen and that was on the corner of East and Main Cross streets. Here they built a small brick church, large enough to accommodate the townspeople, but when the country people came in, the sanctuary was enlarged by building booths around it and covering them with boughs. The pillars in the first Methodist church were Brothers Botsford, Wilson, Cumstock and others and the local preachers were Oglesby, Brown and Wallace.

Camp meetings, that combination of salvation and sociability, were inaugurated in 1817, and the first one was held just outside the town on the banks of Crooked creek. It was largely attended and the church was greatly augmented by it. Silas Ritchie is mentioned as being among the converts and that he never fell back. In 1817, Lawrenceburg circuit was divided. All west and south of Laughery creek became Madison circuit, in the Moores Hill district later.

The churches in Madison circuit are as follows: Trinity church, of Madison, Grace Church of Madison, Kent, Mt. Pisgah, Deputy, Hanover, New Liberty, Canaan, Dupont, Paris, Lancaster, Hopewell, North Madison, Pleasant Ridge, Zoar, Brooksbury, Home Chapel, Ebenezer, Mt. Zion, Morris Chapel.

The first Sunday school organized in Madison was at the home of Mrs. McIntyre. All the children of the town could attend but the teachers must be of the Methodist faith.

In Methodism, there is no power to keep silent the laymen or the laywomen and this subject under the head of Radicalism came to the surface in the early church and caused a rupture. Some of the church members questioned in this wise: "Shall not the layman be allowed to preach and have equal

rights with the preacher?" The question could only be settled by about forty members withdrawing and building another church on Third street, known as the Jewish Synagogue. This was in 1829. Within the course of a few years, the Radicals had change of heart and returned to the parent church. In 1831 the church on the corner of East and Main was abandoned and Wesley Chapel was built. It stood on the north side of Main street, between West and Poplar and was converted into a place of amusement when Trinity church on roadway was built. The first sermon preached in Wesley chapel was by Rev. Lewis Hurlbut. The first trustees of Wesley chapel were John Woodburn, Charles Barnett, William Robinson, John Pugh and Charles Woodard. The local preachers for that year were John W. Sullivan, Gamaliel Taylor and Patrick Brown. It is recorded that they made the sexton of the new church, Wesley chapel, sign a contract to "sweep the church, dust the pulpit and seats, make and keep good fires, light the lamps and extinguish the same, keep order in the house and receive a salary of \$55.00 per year." Would it not be well if we of the present day adopted the same custom?

The colored people were given seats in the gallery at the south end of the church. Very soon they became quite numerous and a branch church was formed for them called A. M. E. (later Ebenezer) on Fifth near Walnut, and a preacher of their own race was supplied.

In 1839 a great revival was experienced under the preaching of a celebrated evangelist of that day, John Newland Maffit, and over four hundred souls were added to the church, many coming from Madison's "400". About this time, Wesley chapel organized a very fine choir and bought a new organ. They were rendering all the new anthems in the most approved style, but strange to relate, it was not pleasing to all of the congregation. Some of them insisted that they return to congregational singing. Others upheld the choir. So one hundred and twenty members of Wesley chapel withdrew and the church building formerly used by the Radicals being unoccupied, they held services there and made melody unto the Lord in congregational singing. In 1844 they built a church on Third street, between Poplar street and Broadway

(what is now the Armory), and called it Robert's chapel. It was organized by Bishop Roberts himself. Phelix Adair in one of his characteristic newspaper articles said, "In the palmiest days of old Roberts chapel, Brother Spivey would start an old hymn which ran thus:

A better church can not be found,
Its doctrines are both pure and sound.
One proof that I can give for this,
The Devil hates a Methodist.

And all the congregation joined in with Brother Spivey.

A few more years and Wesley chapel suffered another break. This time it was because of too long prayer meetings. Those who protested against them first, showed their disapproval of long prayers by leaving the room before the service was concluded. This did no good so they said: "We will not endure it longer, but form a church of our own." This caused the church called St. John's to come into being (1848). Rev. J. S. Bayless was their first pastor. The following men were appointed stewards: Chauncey B. Lewis, John J. Taylor, John E. Moore, William F. Thomas T. J. Doyle, Rena S. Goodrich and John Short. Rev. Gamaliel Taylor and N. D. Ruckle were appointed leaders. For a time they worshipped in No. 1 engine house and in the Upper Seminary, and in two years built a church on the site of the First Methodist church, corner East and Main streets. This church was called St. John's, and was dedicated July 7th, 1850, by Rev. E. R. Ames. It seems there was money enough among them to build another church whenever any disagreement arose, as to preaching, music or length of service. In 1844 a German Methodist Episcopal church was organized to meet the wants of a large number of German speaking people who were coming to make their homes here. They held services in the Upper Seminary for three years and then built on Third street, between Jefferson and Mulberry, what is now known as the Grace church. In those days, the preacher was required to preach both in English and German. Among the founders were the Buehlers, the Ramspotts, the Niklaus, the Hereths, the Schrams, the Bauldoffs, and others. At that time this church belonged to the German conference, but now

all is changed. The preaching is all in English and the church is enrolled in the Indiana conference.

The mighty Methodist church! What a wonderful power for good it has ever been. How superior in its organization as a whole and in all its parts, so that as a rule, "Every church has a pastor and every pastor a church."

Among some of the preachers of that day were the names of Raper, Cummings, Baker, Murray, Irvin Basset, Ray, Wiley, Ruter, Hadenbuth and Wright.¹

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN

This demonination is the union of the Associate Presbyterian, Associate Reformed Presbyterians and the Seceders, and was consummated in 1858. These different branches were all children of the mother kirk of Scotland, but as they grew to maturity, questions began to arise in their minds. One of the rocks upon which the old church split was this query: Shall not each church have the privilege of choosing its own minister? The parent church of Scotland said: No, we will appoint one for you. Thus came into being the branch called the Seceders, who stoutly clung to the right of choosing for themselves in this matter of a minister. This was only one of the many questions that caused the various divisions in the original kirk of Scotland.

The sturdy Scotch-Irish who first emigrated to this country and first settled in New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia and the Carolinas, and finally made their way to Kentucky and Indiana, came with Bible, Confession of Faith, Catechism and Psalm book in hand, and well they knew each one. The first service held by an Associate Presbyterian on Jefferson county soil was in the year 1812. For the time being, the home of George Shannon Sr. was converted into a sanctuary and the service was conducted by Rev. Andrew Fulton, a typical Scotchman. He had been licensed to preach in Edinburg, Scotland, and commissioned by the Associate Presbyterian church to go to "that distant and heathen land of Kentucky" and break unto them the bread of life. He came to Kentucky and labored some years but the church grew so slowly

¹ I am indebted to *History of Methodist Church*, by Rev. W. W. Snyder, and to newspaper article by R. J. Hurlbut, entitled "Methodism in Madison."

and the cause of slavery so rapidly that he decided to cross the Ohio river and see what he could accomplish there. Perhaps he had heard of the little settlement of people from his own country and felt drawn towards them. They welcomed his coming and as said before, he was at once invited to preach for them at the home of George Shannon Sr. Those who gathered to hear the learned Scotchman were the Shannons, the Andersons, Ledgerwoods, Swans, Taylors, Hays, Millers, and some others. A church was organized and, in 1815, Rev. Andrew Fulton became their settled pastor. The location selected for their church building was a corner lot on the farm of James Matthews, in Hanover township. It was central and in close proximity to a never-failing spring of water. They named the church Carmel (a garden land), and most fitting was the name, for on every hand were fields rich in cultivation. Mr. Fulton's parish covered a radius of from twelve to twenty miles. He was a man 60 years of age. This was before that iniquitous device of modern times, called "the dead line," had been invented. Life was strenuous for this minister of the gospel. He made his trips to different preaching stations on horseback, over poor roads, and in all kinds of weather. Big creek station was twenty miles from home; Clark in Clark county, twelve miles in another direction. Little wonder that after only one year and a half, he laid down his earthly armor for a kingly crown. His heartbroken people laid him to rest in the churchyard near by. Mr. Fulton was a man of fine attainments, educated at the University of Edinburg. His congregation must have been composed of people of more than ordinary intelligence to so appreciate his sermons.

There was no way of heating the churches in those days and the Carmel congregation in cold weather gathered at the home of Alex Thompson near by the church. In the heat of summer, they worshipped in God's green temple, the locust grove surrounding the church. The celebration of the Lord's Supper was made a very solemn occasion. The Saturday before communion was made a day of fasting and prayer. The church members who lived at a distance came and stopped with those near the church after the religious services of the day were over. On Saturday evening those who had con-

scientiously kept the fast formed a line and marched to the front of the pulpit where the minister and elders stood and received the sacred lead or token of admittance to the Lord's table on the following day. This custom, together with lining out the Psalms, was dispensed with some years ago. The congregation, young and old, always stood during prayer and sometimes it was three quarters of an hour long. Glad enough they must have been to be seated, but what must have been the weariness at the end of the sermon two hours long. In their sermons great stress was laid on this point: God's people must contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. After the death of Mr. Fulton, so attached had they become to him, that in considering a call to another, they said: None but a Scotchman need apply. In about two years they found a man whose birth and mental qualities were similar to those of Mr. Fulton. In fact, he excelled Mr. Fulton as a Hebrew scholar. So the Carmel congregation extended a call to Rev. Mr. Isaacs to become their pastor, in the year 1821. All ministers of the gospel are not ministers of finance. So it proved in the case of Mr. Isaacs. He was most acceptable as a preacher and all went well until he built for himself a large and comfortable home, found himself in debt, and what may have been worse, in disfavor with some of his congregation. Not willing to let the minister work out his own indebtedness, they contended among themselves until the pastor said he would resign. Part of the congregation begged him to remain, but he thought best to go and removed to Ohio. This left two factions in the church: the supporters of Mr. Isaacs and the enemies of the same. No longer could they affiliate, so twenty-seven of the Carmel congregation withdrew and built another church on ground given by George Shannon Sr. The spot selected was good clay for brick making, so they made a brick kiln in the center and built the church up around it. This unique piece of work was done in 1830, and the church was called Bethel. It belonged to the Associate Reformed Presbyterian body, the same as Caledonia church, and unlike Carmel, which was a member of the body called the Seceders. Bethel church supported a minister, Rev. John McDill, for a few years and then joined with Caledonia church in the support and mini-

strations of a preacher in the person of Rev. N. R. Kirkpatrick. At length, under the pastorate of Rev. Moses Arnott, Bethel church joined forces with Carmel and now shares in the support of its pastor with alternate services in its own church building. Carmel, Bethel, Caledonia and Madison United Presbyterian churches comprised all of that denomination in Jefferson county.

Caledonia church is in Shelby township. Services under this branch of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian church are known to have been held as early as 1818 or 1820. The church was fully organized under Rev. James Worth, in 1834, and the land for the building was given by the Culbertsons; an acre apiece by each, John, James and Samuel. This was known as the Scotch settlement, and among the organizers of the church were Andrew Morton, Peter Van Nice, William Culbertson, Andrew Anderson, Walter Weir and others.

We must add one item concerning the sons of Caledonia. The Culbertsons, Glenn and Jamieson families have furnished a galaxy of men who shine in the universities and colleges over our land.

The records of the United Presbyterian church of Madison are very meager. Sometime before 1836 the Associated Presbyterian body had a preaching station at Madison. In that year, 1836, Rev. George M. Hall came to preach for the congregation which was composed of thirteen families. In about eight years the congregation was strong enough numerically to call a settled pastor. They chose one of the first graduates of Hanover college, an Americanized Scotchman by the name of James Brown, who remained with them eleven years. The first elders in the Madison church were Cranston Taylor, James Falconer and Ebenezer Hillis. The latter, Ebenezer Hillis, was the leading man in the church. He lived in the country, but every Sabbath day, he and all of his family came to attend church. They attended morning service, ate their lunch, which they brought with them, and remained for the afternoon service. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy was a never forgotten command in his household. No week-end guests could leave his house until Monday morning came, nor could they plead an excuse for remaining at home from church. Elder Hillis was also a

man of importance in public affairs, serving as lieutenant-governor of Indiana. When the Associate, Associate Reformed and Seceders united in 1858, the Madison church became known as United Presbyterian. From 1860 the church began to decline owing to changes in the town and deaths and removals and in 1912 the congregation voted to disband. This old landmark on the corner of Vine and Third streets is now in the hands of the W. C. T. U., who are making very good use of it.¹

PRESBYTERIAN

The first resident Presbyterian minister in this county was William Robinson. He organized the first church of this denomination in Madison in 1815. There were not over twenty members. There are no records of the exact time and place of this organization but the names of the elders are given, viz: John Ritchie, Robert Symington and Christopher G. Bergen. They were elected in 1816.

Mr. Robinson had the twofold occupation of schoolmaster and preacher. The salaries paid in those days did not provide a living for the preacher. He must augment that stipend in some way and he was eminently fitted for teaching, so the little town was doubly favored. Whether Mr. Robinson outgrew the town, or for what reason we know not, but his stay was of only two years' duration.

In 1818 the congregation was able to erect a brick church of good size which stood on West street at the head of what is now called Presbyterian Ave. The avenue derived its name from the location of the church. At the first communion service held in the new church, three ministers officiated: Thomas Cleland, John M. Dickey, and Thomas C. Searle. Thirteen additions were made at that time, making thirty-three in all. Another elder was chosen, David McClure. Rev. Thomas C. Searle, a young missionary sent out from Massachusetts, preached for the Madison church, and also the one at Hanover, in 1819. So pleased were both congregations with the ministrations of Mr. Searle that they agreed to call him as their joint pastor, each to pay him the sum

¹ I am indebted for information to Robert E. Culbertson, Harley L. Graham, Rev. N. B. McClung, George Gordon, and to sermon by Rev. H. P. Jackson, delivered at the seventieth anniversary of Carmel Church.

of \$200.00 per year, making his salary \$400.00, with the oversight of both parishes. Mr. Searle accepted the call and was installed by the Presbytery of Louisville, there being no such body as that yet in Indiana. The two churches sustained a terrible loss in the death of this scholarly, pious young man after a pastorate of only one year. He was laid to rest in the Third street graveyard, which after many, many years, has been transformed into a park.

After a lapse of two years, the Rev. Joseph Trimble was called to fill the place of Mr. Searle, but he too fell a victim to the prevailing fever (presumably typhoid) and died before he was installed. His remains were laid in the same graveyard where only two years before the former pastor's remains had been consigned to the dust. These sad occurrences in Madison, followed by the death of two more young ministers in a neighboring field, so deeply affected the community that a day of fasting and prayer was appointed that the people might "humble themselves before God and interpret aright his dealings."

In 1823 the presbytery of Louisville petitioned the synod of Kentucky to form a new presbytery north of the Ohio river, to be called the presbytery of Salem. This request was granted and the boundary lines of Salem presbytery included Indiana, Illinois and Missouri. The synod of Indiana was created in 1826 and was almost boundless. Some accounts say it included all of the Northwest territory. As the presbytery of Salem enlarged, it was divided into three: Salem, Wabash and Madison. At length the Madison Presbyterian church secured another minister, the Rev. James H. Johnston. And now "they thanked God and took courage." Mr. Johnston brought a new era of prosperity and added much to the church's efficiency. But the time came when the congregation could no longer worship together in the beauty of holiness.

After eight years of united effort under James Johnston, sixty three members signed a petition begging the presbytery of Madison to form them into a separate body to be known as the Second Presbyterian church of Madison, Indiana. Then another petition came before the presbytery not to

grant the request for reasons herein stated, the substance of the same being:

Because the church is not large enough when divided to support two ministers. Because we have been long united. Because there is nothing personal to call for a separation, but all the reasons that exist arise from diversity of opinions as to doctrine and duty, and this same difference exists in a greater or less degree throughout almost the whole extent of the Presbyterian church. We can not hope that the present proposed separation will have any tendency to lessen the evil, but will widen the breach and bring with it a train of evils which we feel bound as far as is in our power to prevent. Hoping and praying that the Lord may deliver us from our difficulties, we ardently and affectionately request the presbytery not to sanction the erection of a second Presbyterian church in Madison at present.

The petitioners who wished to erect the Second Presbyterian church included the names of the Laniers, Leonards, Sullivans, Whitneys, Hendricks, McIntyres and others, making sixty-three in all. The petitioners who opposed included the names of the Kings, Lyles, McClures, Reas, Underwoods, Parks, McKees and others, making twenty-eight in all. The presbytery was composed of such men as John Finley Crowe, James Blythe, John Matthews, James H. Johnston, Samuel Grigg, John I. Brown, James Cunningham, Williamson Dunn, Jeremiah Sullivan and Girardus Ryker. They listened to the arguments presented by each side. What should they do? It required the wisdom of a Solomon. Perhaps the presbytery recalled the incident in Solomon's life and were guided by it when they said: "Divide, and if the party of the first part does not relent, the decision is final." The petitioners and the minister, Rev. James H. Johnston, went with them. The cause of this trouble was no trivial one. In four years' time it affected the whole Presbyterian church throughout the United States. Some aver that it was the collision of Calvinism (inherent in the old-time Presbyterian), and what was termed the New England theology. And some claim that if there had been no such thing as slavery the church never would have divided. At any rate there came into existence two factions: The Old School, Calvinistic and Pro-Slavery in its tendency, the New School, ameliorated by the so-called New England Theology and Anti-Slavery in its tendency. The congregation which remained in the church building of West street took the name of First Presbyterian church of

Madison, and was Old School in its leanings. The church newly formed took the name of the Second Presbyterian church of Madison and was New School in its leanings. The first elders elected to serve in the Second church were John Ritchie, James Wilson and Jeremiah Sullivan. This congregation worshipped for a time in the Masonic hall which stood where our present city building stands, on West street. Efforts were made by outside parties to bring about a reconciliation between the divided congregations, but all in vain. In 1835 the Second church bought the lot on Third and West streets and built the edifice still in use. The cost of lot and church building was \$8,000. It is said that the First and Second churches were near enough to hear the sound of each other's voices. J. H. Johnson continued pastor of the Second church for two years, then resigned, coming back later as a supply. After his final departure, in 1838, Henry Little, who was serving as a home missionary in this section, was called to the pastorate and accepted. His work as a home missionary had been eminently successful and the board gave him up with reluctance. After a pastorate of two years, the board so pressed their claims on Reverend Little that he dissolved his relationship with the church as pastor (but continued a member of this church as long as he lived) and again took up the touring of Indiana, Illinois, Ohio and Kentucky as missionary. The little flock left behind known as the First Presbyterian church were enfeebled in numbers, but not in zeal or courage. We find them maintaining all their services, with Rev. J. T. Russel, as stated, supply. Soon after a call was given to Rev. William C. Matthews, who accepted and through whose ministrations of six years blessings both temporal and spiritual visited the church. During Dr. Matthews' pastorate, in 1836, the church building on West street, facing Presbyterian avenue, was taken down and a new church built on the ground where now stands Lodge's hardware store, on Main street. Records tell us that it was a handsome structure, and the loss by fire which befell it in 1845 was a calamity. However, the congregation was not impoverished, and the following year, 1846, found them building another house of worship on Broadway, the one still in use.

There are seven Presbyterian churches in Jefferson county: Madison, organized in 1815; Hanover, 1819; Jefferson, in Shelby township, 1818; Sharon, near Swanville, in Hanover township; Monroe and Smyrna.

HANOVER

Presbyterianism is indigenous to the soil of Hanover, and William Dunn is the man who nurtured it and made it bring forth its first fruit. When the United States government bought this section of country from the Indians, the first man to buy land and build a home in Hanover township was Williamson Dunn, from Kentucky. Here, in 1806, he, with his wife and two children, settled and became the nucleus around which other Scotch-Irish gathered. So necessary did he think it to be identified with a church that he went twenty-four miles to Charlestown and enrolled his name with the Presbyterians there until a church should be organized nearer home. Soon other families came and services were held at the Dunn home, conducted by missionaries, among them Searle, sent out to Indiana from Massachusetts. As a supply, in 1819, he looked after the Madison Presbyterian church and this neighboring one six miles distant, for as yet it had no name. Reverend Searle had a young wife, whose home had been in Hanover, New Hampshire. No doubt her thoughts often dwelt upon the home she had left behind, so when a name was desired for the new parish, Mrs. Searle said it shall be Hanover. As the population increased in Hanover township, the subject of having a church of their own began to be agitated, and in 1820 Hanover congregation was set apart from Madison, the boundary line being at Clifty creek. This called for a church building in which to worship, and Williamson Dunn, prompted by every good motive, gave the ground on which it should be erected. Subscriptions were solicited, but ready money the people had not, so they gave of their substance such as wheat, pork, shingles and various commodities, and of their labor were not stinting. There were four men in the congregation who agreed to meet the indebtedness, if such there should be, in equal shares. They were George Logan, Benjamin Smythe, Robert Symington and Jesse Dickerson. The building was of stone, of good size,

but rude in construction and devoid of anything ornamental in the way of furnishings, so it is not likely those four men who pledged themselves to meet any indebtedness were ever called upon. The gifted young pastor, Thomas Searle, did not live to see the building completed. Before the work progressed very far, he was smitten with a fever and died and was buried in Madison, as stated in a former article. The Hanover church mourned for its pastor, who had endeared himself to them by his wise administration in the pulpit and in public affairs. Educated in Massachusetts, he was endowed with talents which had been brought into use in founding churches and framing laws. Where should the Hanover church look for help in this time of need. Indiana was too young to furnish any, and the needy churches must look elsewhere. They had heard of one John Finley Crowe of Shelbyville, Kentucky, and to him they extended the call. He accepted, coming to Hanover in 1823. He was a young man, thirty-six years of age, but had passed through quite an experience. North Carolina was his native state, but when fifteen years of age he migrated with his parents to the land beyond the Mississippi river. With a number of families who went with them they formed a little colony, and as there were children in these families, a school was needed. John Finley Crowe became the village schoolmaster in this little town of Bellevue, Missouri. Fortunately, this man heard a sermon by an itinerant Methodist preacher that convinced him he must enter the ministry. He went from the little home in Bellevue, Missouri, to Danville, Kentucky, the center of Presbyterian culture and refinement in those days. He absorbed everything about him that was good and improving, prepared himself for college, and in time passed through the theological seminary and was licensed to preach. His first charge was a group of mission churches in Kentucky. The practice of slavery greatly exercised him and he began to talk and write on the subject until he aroused such an antipathy that his own life was in jeopardy. Just at this juncture came the call from the church at Hanover. He spoke of it as the voice of God speaking through his people. It was a happy event for Hanover and for him. His labors are so

interwoven with the cause of education and founding of Hanover college that it shall be left for that article.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN AND REFORMED

This denomination was organized into a church and incorporated July 31, 1842. The church building first occupied by this congregation was one which had been built by the Episcopalians on the corner of what were then called Grafton and Main Cross streets. It was located where the residence of Dr. Hanna now stands. The Episcopalians vacated this church building because it was too far up town and for other reasons. The first trustees of the Lutheran church were B. Waide, D. Schneider and P. Gautzhier, with M. Appenalb as secretary. As soon as they were organized, they obtained a minister in the person of Reverend Krack. Those prominent in the church of that day were the Rists, Dubachs, Friedersdorfs, Scheiks and Lotz, besides the above named trustees and secretary. Early in the church's history the women put their shoulders to the wheel, organizing the first sewing society in December, 1847. This is probably the parent of all other Ladies' Aid Societies in the county.

They were always a music loving company of worshipers. For twenty-five years Miss Louise Huber, who is still in our midst, was organist and leader of the choir.

Not until 1872 did the Lutherans leave their little house of worship for the present building, which was formerly St. John's Methodist church, built in 1831. This is the only Lutheran church in Jefferson county. It has always been large and flourishing.

ADATH ISRAEL

The organization of the Jewish congregation in Madison is lost in oblivion. There has never been but this one synagogue in the county. The Jew has no liking for the isolated life in the country. Towns with commercial activity have always been his choice. His name is also linked with industry and prosperity, so we may safely infer that as soon as Madison began to take on the air of enterprise, the Jews came, adding to its growth in a most substantial manner.

Before the year 1868 this congregation gathered for worship in the second story of the building now occupied by the

Lotz Brothers' shoe store. In that year (1868) they bought the present synagogue from the school trustees. It was built by the Methodists in 1829, but abandoned and sold to the school board later.

The trustees of the congregation at that time were: Henry Hoffstadt, Max Kronenberger, Raphael Sulzer, Aaron Marks, Elias Hilb and Ascher Hoffstadt. On the doorway of the synagogue is this stately inscription that means so much: "The House of the Lord."

The changes that have come to Madison have affected this congregation more than any other. Not that they have deserted or proved unfaithful to the old Mosaic Law. Many have gone the way of all earth and many have followed the swifter currents of business life that flow elsewhere.

This gathering of the Children of Israel is probably conspicuous in being the smallest Jewish congregation in the world. The services are conducted by one of the members, I. L. Stern, without compensation.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL

The Madison church of this denomination is the only one in Jefferson county. Services were first held according to its liturgy in June, 1835. This service was conducted in S. T. Russel's schoolhouse, on West street, by Reverend Peers. The congregation was organized into a parish for the purpose of worshipping Almighty God according to the rites and ceremonies of the Protestant Episcopal church of the United States of America. M. C. Eggleston, J. F. D. Lanier, Courtland Cushing, Isaac Lee and Adolphus Flint were elected trustees. J. G. Marshall, N. C. Brace, J. F. D. Lanier, Isaac Lee, James Siddall, E. G. Doan and M. C. Eggleston were made vestrymen, and Dr. King treasurer of the church.

The congregation soon called Reverend Lamson to become their rector. He accepted and held services in the Masonic hall, on West street (where our city building now stands), and also in the new Second Presbyterian church, corner of West and Third. The following year brought a change in rectors, Lloyd Windsor succeeding Mr. Lamson. It so happened that the man who was employed as sexton had two qualifications. He not only knew how to keep the building

in order, but he also was a musician, so he was given the two-fold occupation of sexton and choir leader, both offices to be filled for the sum of \$75.00 per year.

With another year came another change in rectors, and the new one was Henry Caswell. The congregation began to talk seriously of building a church of their own, and Mr. Caswell said he would plan it if they would build it. They looked about the town for a suitable location which would come within their means. At this juncture Mr. John McIntyre offered them a lot on the corner of Main Cross and Grafton streets. Grafton street is now known as Church street. This offer was gratefully accepted, and the plan which Mr. Caswell, assisted by Matthew Temperly, had made was used and the cornerstone laid in June, 1838.

There developed much dissatisfaction among the church attendants because of the location of the building. They said it was too far up town, and financial matters became affected so the Episcopalians sold their church to the Lutherans in 1841. They worshipped then for a time in Robert's Chapel, on Third street. Then followed a succession of rectors too numerous to mention till we come down to 1848, when we find the congregation under the spiritual care of Robert B. Claxton. For the past seven years the church had been without a fixed abode, holding services in many different places; in the private school building on Poplar street, now the home of William Roth; in the lecture room of the First Presbyterian church, on Main street, where Lodge's hardware store now stands; in an upper room over the Madison insurance company's office, and in the second story of the Cornett building, corner of Main and Mulberry streets.

Dr. Claxton saw plainly that their greatest need was a church of their own, so he urged their building at once. Then came the question of selecting a site. Several were thought of, but fortunately for them, Mr. George W. Leonard offered a lot on the east side of Mulberry street, just north of Third street, with the reservation that five pews should be set aside for himself, wife and heirs. This offer was accepted by trustees and a plan for a new building was selected. It was to be gothic in style of architecture. The cornerstone was laid in October, 1848, and it required two years to complete the

edifice. It was given the name Christ Church of Madison, Indiana. The first service was held in the new church in January, 1850. It was consecrated by Bishop Upfold of Kentucky in February, 1850.

To the unfaltering faith and works of Dr. Claxton and to substantial aid given by a most valued church member, Joseph W. Moore, a banker of Madison, the congregation were indebted for its beautiful house of worship.

The Sunday school building was erected in 1852, and Robert John Wharton was the first superintendent, holding that office a number of years. At his death the office was filled by James Siddall, who remained superintendent as long as he lived, nineteen years.

The first person baptized in the church was Charles H. Doan. The first couple married in church was Robert E. Lee and Virginia Lodge, and the second couple Theo. S. Paine and Sarah Siddall. The first funeral from the church was that of William Brown Bower.

Christ church was the recipient of many useful and ornamental gifts. The solid silver communion service was sent to the church from Birmingham, England. The Bible and prayer book were given by a firm in Philadelphia, and a white marble font given by Mrs. Ellen Shrewsbury, on which was inscribed "To the Glory of God." Dr. Claxon resigned in 1853, greatly to the regret of his congregation. Then came short pastorates of Patrick Henry Greenleaf and George H. McKnight, adding to the church's strength.

In 1864 the residence on the corner of Third and Mulberry was procured as a rectory, making the parochial equipment complete, for which the congregation of Episcopalians had reason for thanksgiving and pardonable pride.

CATHOLIC

This section of the country lying on the highway between the French possessions in Canada and those in Louisiana was often traversed by soldiers of the French army, and with them always came a soldier of the cross, a missionary of the Catholic faith. As they stopped by the way to engage in service, the Indians gathered around, eager to watch the performance of the rites of the mass. French Jesuits came

to labor among the red men, sought their friendship and then gradually unfolded to them the faith they professed. Many embraced the faith and proved loyal, while others became traitorous both in friendship and religious teachings. But the fathers were never dismayed. There is an oral tradition, but no word to substantiate it, that as early in the history of the country as 1817 a Catholic priest on a missionary tour through this part of the state stopped in Madison and held service in a frame building on the corner of what is now Broadway and Third, the home at present of Moses Cochran. There were four or five Catholic families living here at that time, among them the family of William Shannon, John Coleman, the O'Keefes and the father of Judge Sullivan. The marriages in some of these families, having been performed by a magistrate, were considered null and void and the couples were remarried by this missionary priest. Also, several children received the rites of baptism. Many non-Catholics attended this service and the sermon delivered by the priest edified them all.

Th Catholic churches of Jefferson county are four in number, viz: St. Michael's, in the town of Madison, organized in 1837; St. Mary's, 1850; St. Patrick's, in North Madison, 1853; St. Anthony's, on Indian Kentucky Creek, 1869.

These churches belong to the Madison district, which is a part of the diocese of Vincennes. This diocese was set apart in 1834 and the first bishop appointed by the Pope was the Rt. Rev. Dr. Brute. He was a Frenchman by birth. At the time of his appointment as bishop, he was filling the chair of professor of theology at St. Mary's College, in Emmittsburg, Md. As bishop his jurisdiction extended over Indiana and a part of Illinois. In 1857 a change was made in the diocese, cutting down its limits, probably owing to increase in population. Its boundary lines on the north are the southern county lines of Fountain, Montgomery, Boone, Hamilton, Madison, Delaware, Randolph and Warren counties. On the south, east and west it is bounded by the state lines. Bishop Brute made his periodical visits over the diocese on horseback and his experiences were those of hunger, fatigue, danger and exposure, which ultimately brought on tuberculosis and caused his death.

In 1837 the bishop selected a man whom he thought fitted for the work as resident priest in the little town of Madison. His field was scattered over Jefferson, Switzerland, Jennings and part of Ripley counties. Michael Edgar Shaw, the new priest, was reared in the Church of England. When a young man he enlisted in the British army and rose to the rank of a commissioned officer. Towards the close of his army life he embraced the Catholic faith and, resigning his commission, took up the study for the priesthood. Madison was his first pastorate, and St. Michael's church was organized by Father Shaw in 1837. The life of a soldier in the British army did not call for more courage, fidelity and endurance than did the life of this new priest in this new country. His flock was scattered over four counties where there were poor roadways over hills and dales and the journeys must be made on horseback. An assistant was given him in the person of Rev. J. F. Plunkett. Having as yet no church edifice, the congregation gathered for worship in the Masonic hall, on West street, which stood where our present City hall stands. Father Shaw's first baptismal entry was on July 30, 1837. The Masonic hall had been used by various denominations and also for school purposes, and finally the use of it was denied to all. The Courthouse was used by Father Shaw and his congregation for some time, but the sheriff, who held the keys, absented himself on one occasion, and so a different place must be found. Father Shaw cast about until he found a room over Jonathan Fitch's pork house, on the corner of Main Cross and Walnut streets, where P. Hoffman's store is now located.

Feeling the necessity of a church building, Father Shaw hastened its erection as fast as means would allow. The ground was given by Mr. John McIntyre, an Irish Protestant, and tradition has it that the stone out of which the church was built was taken from the second cut on the railroad incline when the road was blasted through. The congregation was composed mostly of people who had come to America to seek their fortunes, but in some way the money was raised to complete the church. Father Shaw may have been as ingenious as Bishop Brute was in another locality. A church edifice was badly needed and the people poor in this world's

goods, but every Irish woman had her pig pen. So this is the way the bishop financed the church building. He said to the women: "Each of you pick out the best pig in the litter, fatten it and bring it to me in the fall." This they did, and the bishop said: "A finer lot of hogs was never sent out of Daviess county," and the church was built. Probably those very hogs came to Madison's porkhouses, for at that time Madison was the porkopolis of the west. Madison was the objective point of many an emigrant. From Cincinnati they came down the Ohio river to the town of Madison, where opportunity beckoned.

So many foreigners were arriving that many different languages were spoken on its streets. Among the foreign-speaking people were many Catholics. Many countries of the European continent were represented in the families of the Pfaus, the Horuffs, Nodlers, Wehrles, Kochams, Dantzers, Wagoners, Kyles, Deverseys and Prenatts. The Prenatt home was one whose doors were ever open to missionaries who traversed over Indiana. The above named and many more came, bringing their trades and enterprises, adding to the industrial importance of the town, as well as strengthening the churches. Father Shaw was a gifted speaker and, having seen much of the world, he could relate his experiences in an interesting manner. On several occasions the townspeople gathered in the courthouse to hear him lecture.

Father Shaw remained in Madison about four years. During that time St. Michael's church was built and it was dedicated on December 22, 1839. How happy the people must have been to have a church of their own, whose doors were ever open, that the penitent might come and offer prayers whenever the cares and sins of the world pressed heavily.

After Father Shaw left Madison a number of priests served for brief periods, and then came Rev. Julian Dulane, who added to the work so well begun by opening a parochial school. None of the priests remained long enough to become identified with the town until Father Dupontivice took charge of the church. He was not only a father to his flock, but a man who endeared himself to all with whom he came in contact. He mingled with the people in their home life, and for twenty-seven years went in and out among them, instructing

them in better ways of living. Many housekeepers of that day were indebted to him for choice recipes brought by him from his native land, France. During the administration of Father Dupontivice, St. Patrick's church at North Madison was built and a school opened for the children of about sixty Catholic families living there. He also had the cemetery near St. Patrick's church laid out and devoted to the use of Catholics.

In 1850 it was thought best to separate the German-speaking Catholics and establish a church for them, so St. Mary's was built, on Second street, between Walnut and East streets, under the oversight of Rev. Anthony Cairns, who assumed a great burden, as the people had little means with which to build a church. This brings us down to the date limit in these sketches of early churches.

Rev. Michael L. Guthneck has been longest pastor of a city church. For nearly twenty-five years Father Guthneck has sought to build up the church over which he is the beloved pastor, to beautify the sanctuary and to call the attention of the people from the things of time and sense to things eternal and heavenly. From his own benefactions a superb Italian marble altar has been placed in the church and a sweet chime of bells to call the faithful to prayers and worship. Many are the improvements he has caused to be made in the neighborhood surrounding the church. His influence for good abides over and throughout the town. A church free from debt, and, better than that, with a surplus fund which is a source of revenue, and with such an able and devoted pastor, how blest they are, this church of St. Michael's.

DISCIPLES

This denomination can be truthfully called an American product. Kentucky was its birthplace, and Thomas Campbell and his son, Alexander, the promulgators. Rev. James W. Lanham, who is the best of authority, says: "This Church of the Disciples was an evolution from what was first known as Newlightism, to the higher and better views which are sometimes discourteously called Campbellism." And he adds: "It was the aim of Alexander Campbell, great and learned as he was, to be only an humble instrument in the hands of

God in calling men from creeds and sects and traditions to the Bible and to Christ."

The oldest church of this denomination in Jefferson county is the Liberty church, about twelve miles from Madison, on the Michigan road, in Monroe township. It was organized in 1828 by Elder Beverly Vawter, and the first service was held at the home of Thomas Jameson, the father of Love H. Jameson, who became such a shining light in the church of the Disciples. The home where the service took place is now owned by John J. Denny.

Thomas Jameson and wife were born in Virginia and came to Kentucky and joined the exodus to Indiana. There was quite a little settlement where they made their home on the Michigan road, and these people were mostly of the same religious faith, known by the public as Newlights, but calling themselves simply Christians. Thomas Jameson and wife embraced the faith and were baptized by immersion by a preacher named John McClung. Evidently their beliefs were not wholly acceptable to themselves, for soon the reformatory movement inaugurated by Alexander Campbell spread abroad, and this small body of worshippers were no longer known as Newlights or Christians, but rather as Campbellites.

Beverly Vawter came under this new influence, the reformatory movement. Born and brought up in the Baptist faith, a son of Philemon and nephew of Jesse Vawter, the founders of that denomination in Jefferson county, it seems remarkable that he should have changed in the slightest degree from the faith of his fathers. So alive to the work did he become that he preached and organized churches all over the county.

After organizing Liberty church and preaching for that congregation in various homes for twelve years, he proposed that the Jameson family give the ground and he would see that a church was erected. This was done, and the present building of Liberty Christian church was erected in 1840.

Beverly Vawter organized the church in Kent and the one in Manville in 1830. Madison, Pleasant Ridge and Lancaster were the next to be organized in Jefferson county. Dupont and Middlefork churches came later.

The denomination differs from others in its form of church government. We might say there is no church government. Every member has a voice in its rulings and there is no appeal to a higher tribunal. If trouble arises, one of the elders rectifies or pacifies it. Any man (or perhaps woman) can preach in this body who feels called to the work and is approved by the congregation. Baptism by immersion is the essential belief and the sacrament is observed every Lord's day. Any one present who has made a profession of faith is invited to partake, thus renouncing close communion.

Jefferson county has always felt a pride in having been the birthplace of one who became a mighty pillar in the church of the Disciples. Love Jameson was born on his father's farm, on the Michigan road, in 1811. When eighteen years of age he was baptized according to the rites of the Christian church, and very soon, influenced by Elder Vawter, he began to preach. For several years he confined his labors to Jefferson county, and then extended them to neighboring states. In 1841 he was called to the Madison church and prospects seemed bright for the young preacher and his bride and the church as an organization. The untimely death of his young wife was such a shock that his health gave way and he was obliged to relinquish his charge as pastor. The following year, 1842, he was called to Indianapolis, and there he spent the remainder of his life, ever showing forth the gospel he professed. He became renowned as much for his singing as his preaching.

The Manville church of the Disciples, in Milton township, organized in 1830, deserves special mention. From this church has come one who has been a prophet among them for over sixty years and an active pastor for fifty-five years. Endowed with rare mental gifts and with a personality admirably fitting him for the highest rank among the preachers of the state, he has chosen rather to remain in this obscure valley of Indian Kentucky creek, hallowing the churches and homes of Jefferson county by his presence, mingling with his friends and neighbors in their joys and sorrows and officiating in a ministerial capacity wherever needed. In fact, you could hardly place him where he would be out of place, so well has he learned the lesson of practical or applied Chris-

tianity. It was by the hands of Love Jameson he, James W. Lanham, received the ordinance of baptism in Indian Kentucky creek when he was nineteen years of age. It was in Hanover college he received his collegiate education, and in his study at Manville he has been continuing his studies ever since. It was at Pleasant Ridge he first preached, finally settling down as pastor of the Manville church, and from the pulpit in that stone church he proclaimed the name of the Lord for fifty-five years. Upon his resignation, the people wished to make him pastor emeritus, but he declined the honor. Surely the "valley has been exalted" by his living in it. Our many-sided friend, farmer, statesman, preacher, has had abundant opportunities for the exercise of all his powers, and the story of his happy, peaceful, useful life is a plenary influence to all who are blessed with his acquaintance.¹

¹ I am indebted for information to Rev. James W. Lanham's book, *Thrilling Themes in Theology*, and to Mrs. M. J. Sanderson and Mrs. Jennie V. Johnson. With three exceptions, living churchmen have not been mentioned in this sketch of Jefferson county churches. These exceptions are that of Rev. James W. Lanham, who served the longest of any pastor of a rural church, and Rev. Michael L. Guthneck, who has served longest as a pastor of a city church, and Mr. I. L. Stern, acting rabbi of the Jewish synagogue

Reviews and Notes

The Centennial History of Illinois, Volume IV. *The Industrial State, 1870-1893*. By ERNEST LUDLOW BOGART and CHARLES MANFRED THOMPSON, University of Illinois, Springfield, 1920, pp. 553.

The characteristic feature of the period of Illinois history covered by this volume is an unbridled competition in the fields of production and commerce. Until 1870 none of the natural resources of the state, except the strictly agricultural, had been touched. The pioneer was primarily a home maker and a home enjoyer. The typical leader of the period following, 1870-1900, was a money maker. It is not accurate to say the captain of industry was more lawless than the pioneer farmer in his struggle. Each was a thorough-going individualist. The farmer would have been dumbfounded had his harvest hands struck and picketed his farm, causing the loss of his crop. Just such was the feeling of McCormick and Pullman. Industrial leaders and farmers with the same traditions found this interest coming in conflict in which the industrialists with their practices of capitalization and monopoly were having the advantage. A third interest, labor, different from both, was struggling for recognition. Transportation interest, distinct from each of the above, entered the struggle, making it still more complex. The farmer justly felt that he was being unduly exploited by these new interests. Each party was organizing for the fight, not always clear as to his enemies and consequently often fighting blindly. Each party, naturally for Americans, turned to the government for relief. The politics of the period, the Liberal Republican, the Greenback, the Union Labor, the Populist and the Free Silver movements, were only the surface reflections of these deeper conflicts. How completely this struggle dominated society is correctly shown by the different chapter headings of the volume under review. Nineteen of the twenty chapters are devoted to the various phases of the struggle. Chapter nine, less than thirty pages, is ample for a discussion of arts and letters during the thirty years. This seems a

pitiful story, and it is. Although society in 1900 was immeasurably wealthier than in 1860, it is doubtful if life was nearly so attractive or enjoyable in Illinois in 1900 as in 1860. The argument or history is enforced by a mass of detail, but if I have read the story correctly, such is the significance of the volume. It is one of the best volumes of the series. The style is easy and clear. The political struggles are described in straightforward, unequivocal, fearless language. Such stories as the hay market riot, the election of Logan to the senate in 1885, the fiasco of the Liberal Republicans and social life in the seventies might justly be called literary.

L. E.

Collections of the Illinois Historical Library, Volume XIV. Constitutional Series, Volume II. The Constitutional Debates of 1847. Edited with introduction and notes by ARTHUR CHARLES COLE, University of Illinois, Springfield, 1919, pp. xxx + 1018.

The making of constitutions may be called an American profession, for each state has a constitution and it is being constantly changed to meet new conditions and ideas. The debates of the second Illinois convention are typical. A reading of these debates will give a new appreciation of our national development.

In his preface to the volume, Mr. Cole points out the difficulty of obtaining reliable sources of information, that the delegates, working in an atmosphere of economy, retrenchment and reform, decided to forego official edition and content themselves with the newspaper versions. The author has reconstructed these debates from the newspapers. They were taken mostly from the tri-weekly *Illinois State Register*, a Whig newspaper, and supplemented in important omissions by items from the weekly edition of the same paper, and from the *Sangamo Journal*, a Democratic organ. These newspapers were partisan and often did not give space to opponents. Reporters and correspondents were not always prompt and often satisfied themselves with memoranda of the topic in discussion. Notwithstanding these conditions, the author has succeeded admirably in bringing the parts together in this volume.

One of the commendable features is the index, which is prepared for the practical use of the political science student. Its use is not limited, for the lover of history will find that it will point out the important current events of the time. The table of contents also contains helps in this respect. Another very attractive feature is the introduction, which sets out incidents of the time, showing the general trend of thought, the men that made up the delegation, questions of national import and party cleavage. The biographical sketches of the delegates in the appendix leads to important identifications.

On the whole, this book will be very helpful to other bodies similarly engaged. It makes no pretensions either to learning or to originality. For those who have not studied the subject of constitutions in the making, the book offers an excellent introduction to a fund of information which needs to be more widely disseminated.

R. G. SMITH

The Centennial History of Illinois, Volume I. The Illinois Country, 1673-1818. By CLARENCE WALWORTH ALVORD, University of Illinois, Springfield, 1920, pp. 524.

The plan of this series is co-operative, with an individual author for each of the five volumes. Mr. Alvord is the editor-in-chief of the series, a work worthy of the occasion which it commemorates.

The first volume is notable in many ways. We first get a delightful picture of the Illinois country as it looked when the Indians still ruled supreme within its limits. But, as the Illinois country was only a part of the vast Mississippi valley, the author has necessarily taken up the history of the conquest of the whole valley. The Illinois country, however, because of its location, through the long period of exploration and colonization, was the scene of constant struggle and change. Occasionally we are given glimpses of the real love and devotion which existed between the natives and invaders, as in the case of Marquette and LaSalle and many others. Mr. Alvord has traced the progress of the Illinois country from the time of the admirable work of these French missionaries through the periods of French and English occupation, the organization under the ordinance of 1787 until

it was admitted into the Union in 1818, with great ability and power, uniting the different parts and influences into a connected whole. In this very interesting development the author never loses sight of the significance and importance of the Illinois country as the heart of the great Northwest.

The entire book shows that it was written only by the laborious process of examining masses of documents, letters, and source materials of all kinds, which is especially difficult because of the early period with which the book deals.

One of the serious defects of the work is the mention of too many names without adequate characterization of each. Another is the tediousness of detail in recounting the almost constant changes among the Indian tribes. Much of this, perhaps, could not be avoided, and in this detail the author never loses sight of the one big idea, the development of the Illinois country. The book is written in a pleasing style and will interest the scientific historian, as well as the casual reader.

DORA BENTLEY

The Centennial History of Illinois, Volume V. The Modern Commonwealth, 1893-1918. By ERNEST LUDLOW BOGART and JOHN MABRY MATTHEWS, Springfield, 1920, pp. 544.

As the title suggests, this history deals with the economic, political and social development of the people of Illinois during the last quarter of a century, 1893-1918.

Progress has been particularly marked in all lines of economic activity. The growth of population, due largely to political and economic opportunities, has stimulated the growth of wealth. Illinois ranks high as an agricultural state and is the leading corn state in the Union. Education and improvements in farm methods have enabled Illinois to maintain her agricultural position. Chicago is the greatest grain market in the United States and is able to hold her position because of access to water transportation, as well as to the network of railroads. Illinois in 1893 ranked as the third manufacturing state in the Union. The meat packing industry, mining, printing and publishing and agriculture are the five most important industries of Illinois. Labor has been restless at various times in Illinois. The great Pullman strike in 1894 and various other strikes which followed are indica-

tions of the growth and power of the laboring class. Labor difficulties soon led to legislation in behalf of labor. Along with labor unrest came the origin and growth of socialism in Illinois.

During the past quarter of a century political development toward a more efficient government has been a slow but steady growth in Illinois. The merit system of appointment to civil service in 1895, and the reorganization of principal administrative services on a more integrated and systematic basis have been especially noticeable. The governor's powers over both legislation and administration have been increased during the past twenty-five years in Illinois. As to taxation, the system in Illinois is rather antiquated, for it was introduced when the state was almost purely agricultural. Undervaluation is the chief defect in the taxation system.

With the growth of wealth in Illinois has come the application of this wealth to education, culture and art. The World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 was a decided stimulus to the social development of the state. In the few years following university buildings were erected, libraries, museums and art institutes were erected and made adequate for the needs of a twentieth century people. A new outdoor life developed in Illinois, 1890-1900, and brought to the front all kinds of modern sports and athletics.

Illinois, in spite of her large German element and the general dissatisfaction at first, achieved a good record in the World War. From point of view of international relations, Illinois is the most important state in the Mississippi Valley. During the World War the citizenry of Illinois responded with growing enthusiasm and achieved a great record both at home and abroad.

The history of the people of Illinois from 1893 to 1918 is clearly stated and is easy to understand. There are a great many details given, but these do not detract from the interest of the account. The story of the state and people of Illinois from 1893 to 1918 is typical of the development of the American state.

HENRIETTA JANE ASKREN

History and Doctrines of the Church of the Brethren.

By OTTO WINGER, President of Manchester College.
Brethren Publishing House. Elgin, Illinois. 1920, pp. 320.

This is a brief textbook containing the history government, doctrines, ordinances and ceremonies of the Brethren church. In many ways these folk are unique. Organized at Schwarzenau, Germany, in 1708, under the shadow of ecclesiastical power they still show the influence of this early discipline. Like the Quakers, they take no part in war, and little, if any, in politics. They settle their difficulties out of court when possible, join no oathbound or secret societies, attend no places of entertainment for pleasure, live the simple life, frugal almost to the point of severity, practice close communion, triple forward immersion in baptism, greet with the holy kiss, receive with the right hand of fellowship, wash each other's feet, shake hands and kiss at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, believe in the real presence and practice more democracy of a kind and charity than any other church.

Under the necessities of modern life the Brethren are breaking gradually from many of their ancient customs. As a class they are among the most prosperous farmers in the state. On their farms are to be found the best machinery including automobiles. Excepting their antipathy for the barber and the tailor one can scarcely recognize them among worldly folks. Much of the money spent foolishly by ordinary people is now being used by them on education, missions and charity. The book in review covers the field indicated in a plain, dignified, straightforward style. It is to be hoped that Dr. Winger will favor us with a more philosophic study of the German religious revolt beginning in the mysticism prevalent about the time of Luther and taking on many forms and names both in Germany and America. He has the solid qualities of scholarship united with the sympathy and insight to give us an invaluable aid in this difficult field of history.

P. M. NKNEMAKER

The Rise of Methodism in the West, Being the Journal of the Western Conference, 1800-1811. Edited with notes and introduction by WILLIAM WARREN SWEET, Professor of History, DePauw University, Cincinnati, 1920, pp. 207.

In Part I of this little book the author gives an interesting sketch of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal church and of the coming of the aggressive Circuit Rider into

the Mississippi valley. Part II is a publication, for the first time, of the journals of the Western annual conference for the years 1800 to 1811, inclusive, with valuable notes made up, for the major part, of quotations from the journal of Bishop Asbury.

Except that the title may be a little too broad, and barring an extra quotation marked on page 21, and the repetition on page 61 of the Cartwright story found at page 30, the book is well gotten up and carefully edited, and gives to the student of history an insight into the great growth of Methodism in the democratic Middle West. The author has rendered a good service to loyal Methodists, and every student of the Mississippi valley can profit by a perusal of the book.

C. J. CARPENTER

A History of Missouri. By EUGENE MORROW VIOLETTE, Professor of History, State Normal School, Kirksville, Missouri. (D. C. Heath & Company, Boston, New York, Chicago, 1918, xxxiii + 500.)

The purpose of the author in writing a history of Missouri was to give Missourians a knowledge of history of their own state in a single brief, interesting volume. The state itself has had a history of unusual interest and ranks high in contributing to our national development. The plan of the book is different from many histories in that it lays little stress upon events in chronological order. Little space is given to events that were strictly local, but those topics that have significance in national history are emphasized.

The author seems to emphasize the early history of Missouri as being more important, for no less than eighteen out of twenty-three chapters are given to the period from the beginning of colonization, about the middle of the eighteenth century, up to and including the Civil war. The beginning chapters are given to the times when the territory belonged to France. These are followed by the period of settling and western migration, the purchase of the territory from France and the expedition of Lewis and Clark. The struggle for admission into the Union is narrated at length, and this is followed by chapters on the Mexican and Civil wars, em-

phasizing the part played by Missourians. Several chapters in the fore part of the book and all the closing ones are given over to economic and social development of the state. Throughout the book the author does honor to the leading personages of the state and to the deeds accomplished by them. The author uses numerous marginal topics, and an extensive table of contents and a good index. A bibliography completes the reading matter, the author having drawn freely from the works of many writers. Maps, charts and illustrations appear quite frequently, and these, together with the simplicity of the language, make the book a very interesting and useful one to be used either as a text or book of reference.

ROBERT D. WILLIAMS

William Henry Wishard, a Doctor of the Old School. By his daughter, ELIZABETH MORELAND WISHARD, with memorial services, his historical addresses and papers and brief history of his wife's ancestry. Indianapolis, 1920, pp. 340.

The name Wishard is an old one, having been traced back to Robert Guiscard. The family is said to have followed William the Conqueror into England, and there received liberal grants of land for distinguished service in the battle of Hastings. Some of the family later migrated to Scotland, where they were well known as early as the thirteenth century, many of them serving in prominent positions in both church and state. During the reign of James VI, Sir John Wishart moved to Ireland. In 1772 William Wishard and family came to America, settling near Philadelphia. After serving in the Revolution he moved west to Nicholas county, Kentucky. In 1825 the family moved to Indiana, about ten miles south of Indianapolis.

Dr. Wishard was born near Carlisle, Kentucky, January 17, 1813, and died in Indianapolis in 1913. When he was twenty-two years old he began to study medicine under Dr. Benjamin Noble of Greenwood, and two years later became a partner of Dr. Noble, and in the same year he married Miss Harriet Newell Moreland. During the winter of 1845-46 he attended the Ohio State Medical College at Cincinnati, and in 1849 was graduated from the LaPorte (Indiana) Medical College. In 1800 he was again a student of the Ohio Medical

College. Dr. Wishard tells of his experiences during the Civil war in his paper, *Some Personal Army Experiences*. After his return from the army, with the exception of four years as coroner of Marion county, he devoted the rest of his life to his profession.

The author, the doctor's daughter, has given a very loving and sympathetic account of his life. The narrative is filled with stories which show character better than words. The many comments and addresses included in the volume show the high esteem with which he was held by his fellow citizens.

The author included the memorial services. Doctor Wishard's historical addresses, papers and other information is of more interest to the relatives and friends, for whom it is written, than to the general public.

The historical addresses are especially interesting because of the accounts of early Indiana times and of the medical profession of those times.

BLANCHE CAIN

Among the interesting pamphlets issued to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of Indianapolis are *Centennial History of Indianapolis*, an outline history, by MAX R. HYMAN; *Early Indianapolis*, by Mrs. LAURA FLETCHER HODGES; *Indianapolis Centennial*, published under the direction of the Historical Committee of the Indianapolis Centennial Celebration Committee, and *Civic Studies of Indianapolis*, by IDA STEARNS STICKNEY.

Early Indianapolis is a sketch of the pioneer life of Indiana from 1820, when Indianapolis was selected as the capital of the state, to 1823. The "Capital in the Wilderness" was named by Samuel Merrill and the plot of the city was laid out by Alexander Ralston. The circle was in the center, with radiating avenues and streets intersecting at right angles. The writer very fittingly uses extracts from an old diary to give the early life of the pioneers. Among the many interesting things mentioned in this diary are a description of the home life of the people, a discussion as to who preached the first sermon, the celebration of a wedding and an infare the next day, and a dance when the husband told the men to dance with their own wives, or if they weren't so fortunate as to have a wife, "to dance with the gals."

Pioneer Indianapolis, the first number of a proposed series of Civic Studies of Indianapolis, is arranged to aid pupils of the schools in their work in civics, geography and local history. It is a description of Indianapolis from the very beginning, when two white men, George Pogue and John McCormick, brought their families to this great forest, with its various kinds of trees, among which darted the deer, squirrels, wolves, etc., to the year 1847, when the first railway reached the community, connecting it with the outside world, and when Indianapolis entered the city stage of government. The author describes the friendship of the Indians and the white man and the novel way in which the Indians were paid for the land which the government bought from them. The author quotes from various sources, and in so doing pictures the early life of Indianapolis, such as the winter and summer of 1821-22, one long remembered. People were sick with malaria because of the swampy land and were unable to cultivate and clear their land. The author discusses the sale of lots after the town was surveyed and describes the moving of the state records and treasury on four-horse wagons from Corydon, the former capital, to Indianapolis, the new capital. Then newspapers were published, societies were organized, streets were laid out, education was started, and in those early years Indianapolis laid the foundation for the splendid city which it is today.

The Indianapolis Centennial is an outline history and description of the capital of Indiana, with illustrations from photographs which show the marked contrast between Indianapolis when it was in its infancy and now, when it is a modern city. One of the striking photographs is that of Pennsylvania street looking north from Washington street, 1856, and the same view today. The material is well selected and organized. The author traces the development of Indianapolis from the time when congress donated four sections of land to the state for its capital to the present time. The moving of the capital from Corydon to Indianapolis, the pioneer life of the early settlers, who had to clear the land and protect themselves against the beasts of the forests and the Indians; the early newspapers, the first courthouse and

the jail, which was burnt down by a negro; first schools and religious meetings, town government, which was organized in 1832; the beginning of railroads, state buildings, participation in the Mexican and Civil wars, business development and the city charter of 1890, which led to the rapid improvement of the city, are clearly outlined. The second portion of the pamphlet outlines the city of Indianapolis at present, such as the area and population of Indianapolis, the commercial and industrial equipment, public buildings, hospitals and charities, educational advantages, buildings and organizations, park and boulevard systems, hotels, theatres, amusements and literary landmarks, especially the home of James Whitcomb Riley.

CATHERINE GLOCKNER

Parke County Indiana Centennial Memorial, by ISAAC R. STROUSE, auspices Rockville Chautauqua Association, 1916, pp. 128.

As stated by the author in the introduction, the purpose is to "collect scattered fragments of Parke county, Indiana, historical lore, particularly that which has remained unwritten." These "fragments" are grouped into thirty-eight sections. "Historical sequence and continuity" were recognized as impossible, causing the memorial to be a series of more or less disconnected accounts of historical events, activities and personalities. The accounts abound in detail and give evidence of extensive knowledge and investigation.

Some of the typical subjects are: Tippecanoe, Camp and Battle, Early Churches (very detailed), Public Improvements, Development of Industries, Parke County Public Men, Base Ball, Turkey Run, Portraits and Sketches, Early Settlers, and Parke County People.

More than half the book treats of persons, both men and women, who have been influential in the history of the county. The contribution of each toward the advancement of the county is emphasized. On the cover is a representation of the "christening" of the county seat, Rockville. Portraits of persons are numerous, as are pictures of prominent places and buildings.

This book contains matter of value to any one interested

in Indiana history, and is especially valuable to those interested in Parke county or Parke county people.

PAUL S. NASH

Michigan Historical Publications, University Series V. The Michigan Fur Trade. By IDA AMANDA JOHNSON. *The Pere Marquette Railroad Company*, an historical sketch of the growth and development of one of Michigan's most important railway systems. By PAUL WESLEY IVEY, Ph.D., Lansing, 1919, pp. 461.

This book, as the title suggests, is a comprehensive and detailed account of the early fur trade in Michigan. The author has divided the periods into regimes: The French, British and American. The French regime includes an account of early settlements and the work of the Jesuits among the Indians. In the British regime the author compares and contrasts the occupations of the French and British and the significance of the fur trade during the Revolutionary war. Following the British occupation comes the American occupation. In this the author describes the ever-increasing friction between British and Americans in fur trading. The book shows that the author has made a wide and varied search for the material that is included in it, and by studying its contents a reader is made familiar with one of the earliest and most bitterly contested pursuits of the early northwest. The outline at the beginning of the book and the numerous footnotes throughout are very useful and beneficial to a careful and critical reader.

The author in some respects failed to show the historical connections between the various changes in the central part of the territory, so that the ordinary reader has difficulty to grasp the cause and significance of the transitions. In other respects the book is well written and is a valuable source of information.

EDGAR SWAIN

Year Book of the State of Indiana for the Year 1919. Compiled and published under the direction of James P. Goodrich, Governor, by the Legislative Reference Bureau, CHARLES KETTLEBOROUGH, Director, Fort Wayne, 1920, pp. 1190.

The "Year Book" is designed to be a manual of the Indiana state government. It presents in a compact form the essential parts of the annual official reports of all the state offices, boards, commissions, departments, bureaus and institutions, except the educational, benevolent and correctional institutions, whose reports are issued separately.

The first year book was published in 1918. It was published by the Legislative Reference Bureau, under the direction of the governor. Each office, board, commission, bureau or department maintained wholly or partly by the state funds is required to submit a report setting forth the duties, functions, personnel, expenditures, income and extent of the achievements and activities during the year. The remainder of the book is devoted to a discussion of local government, including counties, townships and towns, together with such agricultural, economic, financial and social statistics as seem to be of general importance.

The book includes a message from the governor delivered to the General Assembly January 9, 1919. He compliments Indiana upon her patriotic part in the World War. He discusses the constitutional amendments that were passed by the legislature in 1919 and recommends that they be approved by the General Assembly of 1921, and all pending proposals to amend the constitution be rejected. Also that the office of attorney-general be made appointive by the governor, rather than elective, and that the teachers' pension law be amended, a Fairbanks monument be erected in honor of ex-Senator Fairbanks, and a memorial be given to James F. D. Lanier, who so willingly loaned the state money for carrying on its part in the Civil war.

The most interesting report was given by the department of conservation. The director of the commission first gave the history of conservation of natural resources. The pioneer was destructive before he was conservative. "He could not have been otherwise. He fought civilization's battles that civilization may enjoy peace and prosperity."

President Roosevelt declared conservation second in importance only to morality and urged the passage of laws by the states and congress enforcing conservation. He said conservation "means the utilization of those resources under

such regulation and control as will prevent waste, extravagance and monopoly; but will at the same time, not merely promote, but encourage such use and development as will serve the interests of the people generally."

ELIZABETH LARRABEE

Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 70. Prehistoric Villages, Castles and Towers of Southwestern Colorado. By J. WALTER FEWKES, Washington, 1919, pp. 79 + 33 plates.

The prehistoric ruins with which this work deals are located in southwestern Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and Utah, the domain of the Cliff-dwellers. The purpose of this article, as stated by the author, is to apply the observations which he made on trips taken in 1917 and 1918 to this region to the determination of the culture of the prehistoric period.

Reference is made to the works of Jackson, Holmes, Morgan, Prudden, Nordenskiöld and others in this field. The ruins are classified in four groups, (1) villages or clusters of houses, (2) cliff-houses, (3) towers and great houses, and (4) rooms. Following is a more or less minute description of about sixty different ruins. The description is illustrated by many drawings to show the location and ground plans of the ruins, and also by an appendix containing seventy-one photographic views of the various ruins. Some space is given to the Grass Mesa, the cemetery, the artificial reservoirs, the pictographs and the pottery and stone implements found in this region. Finally, the author draws from the foregoing analysis conclusions as to the culture of the period.

This article will be of greatest interest to those working in the field of American ethnology, as it summarizes what has been done and shows that much remains to be done in the way of excavation and reconstruction of the ruins.

WELTHY AGATHA SHIVELY

Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 60. Handbook of Aboriginal American Antiquities, Part I. Introductory. The Lithic Industries. By W. H. HOLMES, ethnologist in charge. Washington, 1919, pp. 380.

This book forms one of the series of handbooks of the

Bureau of American Ethnology, completed by M. Holmes while chief of the bureau. It is written not so much as a formal presentation of the subject as for reference, and presents the antiquities of the continent so as to make them available to the student who is interested in the evolution of culture among men.

In the evolution of civilization too little care is given as a rule to prehistoric culture. Although the task is difficult and presents many complex problems, due primarily to general misunderstanding, misinterpreted data and lack of concrete knowledge, the author has given his best efforts, the valuable work of a lifetime spent almost entirely in study and research upon this subject. It is one of the best brief works available upon the subject. In tracing race origin the author relies upon living people, grave remains, art and industries of the aborigines and traditions.

Man is traced back to the quaternary period of the glacial epoch in America, but there is no conclusive proof of man's existence in America before that time. The beginnings are probably found in Asia. The logical way of coming to America seems to have been by the Bering strait. This progress was the result of a gradual migration in the face of great dangers, but analogies tend to show that man readily adapted himself to each new environment. The effects of this migration were many new activities, such as the study of metallurgy, building, art, etc., and upon this range of culture depends the whole aboriginal advance from savagery to civilization. All this data depends largely upon chronology which has been determined back to 100 B. C.

The culture areas of the continent number some twenty-two, influenced largely by climate and geographical conditions. The subject matter of archaeological research is classified according to the methods of treating material, the tools employed being derived from animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms. A great deal of space is given to the method of acquiring minerals and to the history and location of various mines.

The task of the author is complex and covers a large field, open almost to unlimited research, but the analysis is very suggestive. Those who desire a thrilling story will be dis-

appointed, although the work as a whole is interesting. There are parts, however, that might be made less technical; too much space might be said to be devoted to the acquirement and utilization of material and not enough relation shown between the various culture areas.

M. J. LONSDON

Thirty-third Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1911-1912. By F. W. HODGE, ethnologist in charge, Washington, 1919, pp. 677.

The book is divided into six parts: The Administrative Report; Uses of Plants by the Indians of the Missouri River Region, by Dr. Melvin Randolph Gilmore; Preliminary Account of the Antiquities of the Region Between the Manchos and La Plata Rivers in Southwestern Colorado, by Earl H. Morris; Designs in Hopi Pottery, by Jessi Walker Fewkis; The Hawaiian Romance of Laieikawai, with introduction and translation by Martha Warren Beckwith; and appendix containing abstracts from Hawaiian stories collected by Forander and edited by Thomas G. Thrum of the Bishop museum, Honolulu.

The first forty pages are taken up with the administrative report, giving the results of ethnological researches among American Indians and the natives of Hawaii, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution. It also includes reports on other phases of the work of the bureau.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is the paper by Dr. Gilmore. He shows a knowledge of the folklore, ritual, ceremony, custom, song, story and philosophy of the Indians which makes the taxonomic list of plants, which covers seventy-seven pages, far from being a recital of dry, uninteresting facts such as one might expect from the treatment of a technical subject. Preceding the list of plants are three well written articles on Ethnic Botany, Influence of Flora on Human Activities and Culture, and Influence of Human Population on Flora, with especial reference to the bearing the subjects have on Indian life. In the second paper, by Earl Morris, the minor antiquities that are pictured together with his interesting description gives the reader a good pic-

ture of the manners and customs of these ancient Indians. The third paper furnishes a good key to the interpretation of the decoration of ancient Hopi earthenware. The Hawaiian Romance of Laieikawai has 345 pages given to it. The story, which is given both in English and the Hawaiian languages, is preceded by an introduction giving information concerning the author of the story, as well as facts concerning the prose and poetry of the Polynesian groups. Each of the papers given is followed by a bibliography which would be very helpful to the student of these subjects. As to type, paper, binding and illustration, the work is very pleasing. The book is attractive and readable not only for the student of ethnology, but the general reader as well. MARY M. MANRING

Bulletin Seventy-one of the Bureau of American Ethnology. Native Cemeteries and Forms of Burial East of the Mississippi. By DAVID I. BUSHNELL JR., Washington, 1920, pp. 160.

This book consists of 148 pages of fascinating reading, with an excellent bibliography and some most interesting photographs and illustrations of excavated cemeteries and ossuaries. The author has given an accurate and detailed account of the burial customs of the Indians which in former times inhabited the vast territory extending from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. Only the ancient mounds and remains of the dead are now left of the native tribes, and, considering the great change which has occurred, it is interesting to study this remaining evidence.

Although seldom did one tribe follow a single method of disposing of their dead to the exclusion of all others, every tribe appears to have had some characteristic form of burial. The tribes are dealt with separately in the description of the forms of burial, and it appears that the same tribes had different customs, as they were scattered in various parts of the country. For example, the author states that the Algonquians of New England deposited their dead in pits, while those tribes farther west followed a form of scaffold burial.

The book is completed by an adequate conclusion which sums up the author's statements and gives a brief resume of the field covered. The work represents a great amount of

labor, for it was necessary, when attempting to recount the entire procedure of each burial, to quote from several narratives, and then a vast number of records left by early missionaries and explorers were utilized. ELINOR K. FORD

Petroleum and Natural Gas in Indiana. By W. N. LOGAN, State Geologist, Published by the Department of Conservation, State of Indiana, Division of Geology, 1920, pp. 279.

This is a technical handbook of the oil and gas industries, so far as they are affected by the science of geology. There is no attempt to advertise the resources of the state beyond what is shown in a scientific study of its geology. On the other hand, it is hoped that such a report will tend to restrain the drilling of wells where geological conditions warrant no hope of success. It is doubtful if enough money has been made in the oil and gas industry to pay for drilling the wells. Chapter one is a caution to the "wild cat" prospectors who rouse excitement in a community, raise ten to twenty thousand dollars, waste it in drilling a dry hole and pass on to grill another community. There follows a discussion of the properties and origin of gas and petroleum. Chapters follow on the geologic structures favorable to gas and oil and the best methods of prospecting. The body of the report is taken up with a description of structure and the development of the industry in each county. Records of one or more wells are given for each county, showing depth of each stratum. Sixty-three maps and diagrams, including five folding maps, illustrate the report.

A Short History of the Great War Dealing Particularly With Its Military and Diplomatic Aspects, and the Part Played in it by the United States, by WILLIAM L. MCPHERSON, Military Critic of the New York Tribune. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1920, pp. 410.

Anyone wishing to secure a readable history of the military operations of the great war, probably cannot do better than to read this short history. It is not a book setting forth the stratagems of the war, but rather one setting forth a fairly "clear and accurate running account of the war's origin and progress." The chronological form of treatment has been

more or less closely followed, and while the work cannot be considered valuable as a prolonged narrative; as an epigrammatic "outline story" of the war it deserves credit.

Whether this history or any of its contemporaries will remain important as historical statements after four or five years have passed, cannot as yet be foretold. Not only will our judgment as to many important factors be changed by growing viewpoints concerning the Balkan situation, economic phases, et cetera, but there will be revelations, both official and personal, that will modify many statements made immediately following the war's close; for instance, the change of administration either in England or the United States would perhaps clarify our vision of the underlying causes both for the beginning and end of the conflict.

There are many matters which are omitted, or mentioned with very little reference—no doubt intentionally—which seem to me to be of great significance in regard to the diplomatic phase of the war, such as the Zimmerman note to Mexico, exit of Dr. Dumba, and the real story of peace negotiations conducted in Switzerland in 1917-18.

This short history relating chiefly to the military facts of the world war contains forty-two rather concise chapters each of which deals with some significant phase. While those phases which are discussed are ably handled, and while some are by their very nature excluded, others such as the diplomatic phases seem to be greatly underestimated.

The least complete part of the history is that which tells of America's participation in the struggle. Only ten pages are devoted to the actual participation, three of which are given over to a complete statement of President Wilson's Fourteen Points. Possibly it was very well that the author chose to speak but briefly of the part played by the United States, for a fuller expression of America's part could have been given only at the risk of seeming partisan. That he kept close to his idea of a "running account" is to be greatly commended.

Up to this time there is probably no other history of this kind which will give to the reader a more comprehensive view of the military tactics and operations, and their natural linking together. Although the results which this book accom-

plishes in the way of new light are negligible, yet as regards the interlacement and significance of military and diplomatic affairs and their final outcome it can be recommended.

JAMES L. GOFF

The Old Northwest, by FREDERICK AUSTIN OGG, Professor of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin. Vol. 19 of the *Chronicles of America Series*, edited by Allen Johnson, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919.)

This volume of Mr. Ogg's presents a most interesting account of the general history of the Northwest covering the period from 1760, the fall of Montreal, to 1849, when Minnesota, the last of five commonwealths, was given territorial organization.

The difficulties that beset the early settlers in their control of the Ohio valley and beyond are graphically portrayed. Especially vivid is the full account of the early relations of white men and red men, to which fully one-half of the book is devoted. The entire book reflects the life and spirit of the people. Chapter seven is especially rich with this information. Not only does Mr. Ogg give us here an intimate acquaintance with their mode of living and thinking, but we can readily appreciate the dangers and anxiety with which life on the frontiers are filled. An excellent account is given of the migration to the west which even the wretched facilities of transportation could not restrict. Emphasis is placed on the consequent great divergencies which grew up among the settlers. And, says Ogg, "Nowhere else was the road for talent so wide open, entirely irrespective of inheritance, possessions, education, environment. Nowhere outside of the trans-Alleghany country would the rise of a Lincoln have been possible."

The narration is lucid, vivid, and interesting. The progress of the Old Northwest in losing its frontier character—first the Ohio country and later the upper Mississippi country—and the ultimate attainment of statehood is the theme of the book. The work is admirably done.

BLANCHE ROSENTHAL

Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society, Volume XVII.

Minnesota Geographic Names, Their Origin and Significance. By WARREN UPHAM, Archaeologist of the Society, Saint Paul, 1920, pp. VIII + 735.

In the preface of the volume Mr. Upham discusses at some length the sources of his information and throughout the book additional information is given as to these sources. The first main division of the volume entitled "General Features" deals with the origin of the name Minnesota and other outstanding physical features such as lakes and rivers. In regard to the origin of the name "Minnesota" as first applied to the river, the author says, "An illustration of the meaning of the words was told to the present writer by Mrs. Moses N. Adams, the widow of the well known missionary of the Dakotas. She stated that at various times the Dakota women explained it to her by dropping a little milk into the water and calling the whitish clouded water Minne Sota."

Following the general features are divisions dealing with the counties alphabetically arranged and following each brief sketch of the origin of the name of the county is an alphabetical list of the names of its townships and villages with their origins. The volume closes with three interesting chapters dealing with the three cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth, respectively.

The volume shows the result of much travel, inquiry and investigation.

HARRY A. CONDON

Lake Maxinkuckee: A Physical and Biological Survey. Vols.

1 and 2, large octavo, 1172 pages, 38 colored plates, 15 halftones, 23 text-figures and one map. By WARREN EVERMANN and HOWARD WALTON CLARK, Department of Conservation, State of Indiana, Indianapolis, 1920; \$3.50 in Indiana, \$5.25 without the state.

In the summer of 1899, Dr. Evermann, with several specialists, began a physical and biological survey of Lake Maxinkuckee.

Lake Maxinkuckee was selected chiefly because the physical and biological conditions were so bunched as to enable the studies to be carried on with economy of time and effort. Field work was begun in July, 1899 and continued for longer

or shorter periods every year until November, 1913. From July 1, 1900, to July 11, 1901, the observations were carried on daily.

A physical survey of the lake and its catchment basin was made, so that the topography of the lake bottom as well as that of the surrounding country was definitely determined. More than 2,000 soundings were made, and the depths indicated by contour lines on the map which accompanies the report.

More than 20,000 temperature observations were recorded, and chapters are devoted to the temperature of the air and the water, also to winds, rain, frost, fog, dew, snow, and ice. It was found that, in the late summer and early fall, there is no absorbed oxygen in the water of the lake below a depth of 45 feet. This absence of oxygen disappears, however, some time in the fall when the lake "turns over," or when the fall storms disturb the lake, causing a mixing of the water of the various depths. This, of course, means that deep-water fishes such as whitefish and lake trout can not live in Lake Maxinkuckee.

Very naturally, most attention was given to the biology of the lake. Both the fauna and the flora of the lake are very rich in species. There are in and about the lake more than 130 species of mollusks, and 37 species of reptiles and amphibians. There are in the lake 64 species of fishes.

Much attention was given to the habits of the fishes, particularly those of interest to the angler, of which there are more than a dozen important species. The abundance and habits of each and the various methods of capture, seasons, baits and lures are fully presented. Over 200 pages of text are devoted to the fishes. There are 36 excellent colored plates of fishes, also nine halftones and 23 text-figures.

The flora of the region is equally rich and 400 pages of the monograph are devoted to it. The total number of species is 838, of which more than 50 are aquatics. The two volumes of this monograph make an excellent appearance. A good quality of paper has been used and the type in which the text is set makes the page easy to read. The colored plates and halftones are unusually fine.

Official Bulletin of the Indiana State Fire Marshal, Sept., 1920. By H. H. FRIEDLEY, State Fire Marshal.

In this pamphlet the marshal describes and illustrates various conditions which lead to destruction by fire. Among those mentioned are dishonest insurance, the wooden shingle roof, defective flues and stovepipes, inflammable liquids, the garage rubbish, careless smokers, et cetera.

The Indiana Child Welfare Association. By EDNA HATFIELD EDMONDSON, Field Secretary, Indiana University Extension Bulletin, Vol. V, No. 5.

This pamphlet of 86 pages is a history and explanation of the movement to give more definite and intelligent attention to the growth and development of the children of the state. A wide organization has been perfected including a chairman in every county in the state save thirteen. A state committee has charge. Its activities extend to every field and phase of child life.

Tenth Annual Report of the Southwestern Hospital for the Insane. Cragmont near Madison, year ending September 30, 1919. By DR. JMAES W. MILLIGAN, Supt.

The report shows a property investment by the state of \$1,741,296; average enrollment for year, 1,164—609 men and 555 women. The report shows a decrease in attendance of 12. The total expenditures for the year were \$252,657.

Thirteenth Annual Report of the Eastern Hospital for the Insane, at Easthaven, near Richmond; year ending September 30, 1919. By DR. SAMUEL E. SMITH, Supt.

This institution has an investment value of \$1,173,319. There were 911 patients remaining, September 30, 1919, showing an increase of 11. The per capita cost of each inmate for the year was \$256.44.

Michigan Military Records: The D. A. R. of Michigan Historical Collections. By SUE IMOGENE SILLIMAN, State Historian of the D. A. R. Bulletin No. 12, Michigan Historical Commission, 1920, pp. 244.

The contents of this Bulletin are divided into four parts:

(1) Revolutionary soldiers buried in Michigan, (2) Pensioners of Territorial Michigan, 1830, (3) Michigan Medal of Honor men, 1814-1918, (4) General Pershing's Tribute to soldiers of U. S. in France.

History of the Twenty-First Field Artillery From June 1, 1917, to February 22, 1919. By KENYON STEVENSON, Second Lieutenant, 21st F. A. Printed in Luxembourg, pp. 40.

This pamphlet is divided into five chapters, dealing with organization and home training, Valdohon and St. Die, the St. Mihiel drive, holding the St. Mihiel sector, and since the armistice. This is a brief story of one battery, interesting as all such close up stories are. The author was official historian later of the Fifth division and his manuscript history of that division is one of the best real histories of the war I have read.

THE *Annals of Iowa*, after a rest from October, 1915, to April, 1920, contains in its July number two treaties with the Sac and Fox Indians, 1841, 1842; also an autobiography of John A. Kasson, one of the best known public men of Iowa.

The Dubois County Settlement Stone. By GEO. R. WILSON. 1919; pp. 47.

December 31, 1919, George R. Wilson presented to the commissioners of Dubois county a stone marker for the place of the first settlement in Dubois county. The first settler's name was William McDonald. He settled in 1801 near where the Yellowbank trail from Owensboro crosses the Vincennes or "Buffalo" trail from Louisville. The vicinity was well-known to pioneer Indiana as the "Mudholes"—once a great buffalo wallow. The little booklet contains many valuable biographical notices of local men—G. W. Johnson, Geo. H. Proffit, Touissant Dubois, W. E. Niblack and others

The Missouri Historical Review for 1920.

The April-July (1920) number gives half its space to the History of Woman's Suffrage in Missouri. This is the first complete history of woman's suffrage in an American commonwealth and Missouri should be proud to have the

honor. Its success is largely due to its excellent leaders, who, in the darkest hours, did not give up hope. The whole number contains points of unusual interest, especially Dr. Bek's article, *The Followers of Duden*.

The October issue is the centennial number. Such men as Walter B. Stevens, Jonas Viles, W. V. Byars and Edward J. White have contributed articles. Starting with "*The Travail of Missouri for Statehood*" we are given a hundred years of commonwealth history. The articles include social, economic and historical changes that have taken place. A new historical spirit is being roused over the state by the *Historical Review*

HELEN GILBERT

THE *United States Marine Corps in the World War* is a 100 page pamphlet by Maj. Edwin N. McClellan, officer in charge of historical division. It is a brief summary of the organization and operations of this famous body of troops. Published by the government, 1920.

THE April and June numbers of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* contain a valuable journal of a trip down the Cumberland, Ohio and Mississippi rivers in 1807.

THE *Minnesota History Bulletin* for March contains an address by Carl R. Fish on American Democracy and a description by Louis H. Roddes of the last Indian uprising in the United States.

THE *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, April, contains an article by George F. Robison on special municipal charities in Iowa, 1836-1859; a historical review of northwestern Iowa in 1855, by J. L. Ingalsbe, but more interesting to Indianians is a discussion of the old question of the conduct of Gen. Lew Wallace at Shiloh, by Joseph W. Rich.

THE *Sulgrave Review—Bulletin No. 3*. Sulgrave is an international society—organized to promote good will among the English speaking nations of the world. This is being done by celebrating events of English-wide importance, such just now as the tercentenary of the landing of the Pilgrims,

establishing international scholarships in British and American universities, and a score of other similar ways. The home of the society is Sulgrave Manor, Northamptonshire, England, ancestral home of Washington.

THE January *Michigan History Magazine* has an account of Fort Gratiot and its builder, by William L. Jenks; the Treaty of Saginaw, 1819, by Fred Dustin; Rise and Progress of Hope College, by Dr. Ame Vennema, and an article by Leigh Cooper on early French influence in Detroit. The number contains 304 pages. Considering it is just starting on its fifth volume its size indicates a robust health.

THE *Catholic Historical Review* has an account by Rev. V. F. O'Daniel of the early Dominican missionaries in Kentucky. Indiana was once a part of the same diocese as Kentucky and such a contribution as this on the lives of Badin and Nerinckx is full of interest. A number of letters are printed, those by the Belgian Nerinckx in Latin. The July *Review* contains a biography of John Baptist Purcell, who succeeded Fenwick, the second bishop of Cincinnati, September 26, 1832.

THE principal article in the July *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* is on the life and service of Colonel Henry Boquet, by Edward E. Robbins. The Moravian missions of the Ohio valley, by Charles W. Dahlinger is the leading article in the April number.

THE *Essex Institution Historical Collections* for April, 1920, has for its chief attraction a beautifully illustrated history of Steam Navigation in New England, by Francis B. C. Bradlee. The story continues through the July and October numbers.

THE *Journal of History* for July is largely occupied by the proceedings of the general conference of the Church of the Latter Day Saints. The April number contains an autobiography of Henry A. Stebbins, Memoir of John Shield, and a local history of Pottawattomie district.

The Conquest of the Old Southwest. By ARCHIBALD HENDERSON, Ph.D., D.C.L., New York, the Century Co. 1920.

This book is a production of that ripe, southern scholar, Archibald Henderson.

The printing, index, notes and bibliographical notes are all that could be desired. The book contains sixteen full-page illustrations and a useful map.

"The Old Southwest" is a term applied to western Virginia, the Carolinas, Kentucky and Tennessee, and the period covered by the work is the period of settlement, 1740-1790. This book might be studied with profit as a continuation of the subject discussed by D. Frederick J. Turner in "The Old West."

Mr. Henderson's treatment of this highly romantic and thrilling period of American history is skillful and sympathetic. He shows how land hunger and wanderlust, or acquisition and inquisition, have been the motives back of our remarkable western expansion. The part played by the various racial elements, especially the Scotch-Irish, in developing "The Old Southwest", in creating the distinctive American character, is forcefully portrayed. The pioneers, Daniel Boone, John Sevier and the land companies that helped to colonize this region are treated with much understanding and appreciation of their real value and contributions.

This book is of special value because it recognizes the important part that the south and west have played in the development of the distinctive American character and democracy. This element in our national history has been too often neglected. The hunters, traders and farmers of the west and south, shut off from rapid, easy communication with the outside world developed a society quite different from that of their European ancestors and even that of the Atlantic coastal plain. American daring, boldness of conception, buoyancy of spirit, ready initiative and democracy experienced its greatest growth and evolution on the frontier. All of which the author truthfully shows.

For the general reader or historical student who is seeking a readable, historically accurate account of the pioneer movement into western Virginia, the Carolinas, Kentucky and Ten-

nessee and the contributions of these pioneers to our national life this book is of great value.

RUTH STEVENS

OHIO VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

THE Annual Meeting of the Ohio Valley Historical Association was held in Columbus, Ohio, October 15 and 16. The Friday evening and Saturday morning meetings were joint sessions with the Ohio History Teachers' Association.

Among the interesting papers read was one by Prof. H. C. Hockett, Ohio State university, on "The Extinction of the Indian Title in Ohio beyond the Greenville Line" and another by Prof. E. A. Miller of Oberlin college on "New England Influence on Ohio's Public School System."

Saturday morning two papers by Mr. S. H. Ziegler, Director of Civics and History in the Cleveland high schools, on "Some Phases of History Teaching in the Cleveland high schools" and another by a Mr. Edward S. Dowell of Bucyrus high school on "The Method of History Instruction used in the Bucyrus High School" called forth lively discussion and questioning.

A joint luncheon session was held at noon at the Chittendon hotel. Pres. K. S. Latourette of the History Teachers' Association outlined some interesting historical work waiting to be done, in his paper "The Future of the Ohio Valley Historical Association."

Professor Siebert has a plan of getting more men interested in this work and has secured about \$200 for the work of the association.

The publication of the report of the Berea meeting has been delayed longer than it should have been owing to the lack of money in the treasury. But it is hoped there will soon be enough to publish this report and also some of the papers read at Pittsburgh and Columbus.

Rare Books on American and Indiana History for Sale

Terrell's Reports—Indiana in the Civil War, 8 vols.	\$8.00
Banta, Historical Sketch of Johnson County	1.00
Indiana's Roll of Honor, Civil War, Vol. 1	2.00
The Indiana Soldier—Civil War—2 vols.	4.00
Streightoff, Indiana, A Social and Economic Survey	1.00
Moore, Hoosier Cyclopedia	1.00
Wylie, Indiana University 1828-1890	1.00
Harding, Indiana University 1828-1904	1.00
Dye—Some Torch Bearers of Indiana	1.00
Woodburn, Higher Education in Indiana	1.00
Clark's Campaign in Illinois—Pirtle	1.50
Henry, Political Platforms of Indiana	1.00
Moore, History of Hanover College	1.00
Young, History of Wayne County	1.00
Dunn, Indiana	1.00
Howe, The Great West	1.00
Legislative and State Manual, set	8.00
Woodburn, Hall's New Purchase	1.25
Dillon, History of Indiana	7.50
Burnet, Notes of the Northwest Territory	5.00
Foulke, Life of Morton, 2 vols.	5.00
Monks, Courts and Lawyers of Indiana, 3 vols.	15.00
Sweet, Circuit Rider Days in Indiana	1.50
Levering, Historic Indiana	2.00
Howe, Historical Collections of Ohio, 2 vols.	3.00
Thayer, Life of John Hay, 2 vols.	4.00
Strickland, Autobiography of Peter Cartwright	1.00
Moore, Life of Schuyler Colfax	1.50
Thompson, Stories of Indiana	1.00
Shirts, Primitive History of Hamilton County	1.50
Eggleston, First of the Hoosiers	1.00
Harrison, This Country of Ours	1.00
Blaine, Twenty Years of Congress, 2 vols.	5.00
Dunn, True Indian Stories	1.00
Brevier Reports, per vol.	.50

ADDRESS THIS MAGAZINE

A HISTORY OF INDIANA

From Its Exploration To 1918

In two volumes, 1,120 pages.

BY

LOGAN ESAREY, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Western History in Indiana University

VOL. I.

- I THE FRENCH IN INDIANA.
- II THE ENGLISH PERIOD, 1764-1779.
- III THE CONQUEST OF VIRGINIA.
- IV CLOSING CAMPAIGNS OF THE REVOLUTION.
- V INDIAN WARS, 1790-1796.
- VI GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORY.
- VII INDIANA TERRITORY, 1800-1816.
- VIII INDIANA AND THE WAR OF 1812.
- IX FROM TERRITORY TO STATE.
- X THE STATE GOVERNMENT AT CORYDON, 1816-1825.
- XI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1825-1835.
- XII RELIGION AND EDUCATION IN EARLY INDIANA.
- XIII POLITICS FROM 1825 TO 1840.
- XIV REMOVAL OF THE INDIANS FROM THE STATE.
- XV THE PUBLIC LAND IN INDIANA.
- XVI SYSTEMATIC INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.
- XVII THE SECOND BANK IN INDIANA.
- XVIII THE PIONEERS AND THEIR SOCIAL LIFE.
- XIX THE MEXICAN WAR.
- XX THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1850.
- XXI POLITICS FROM 1840 TO 1852.

VOL. II.

- XXII INDIANA IN THE FIFTIES.
- XXIII CIVIL WAR POLITICS.
- XXIV THE COMMON SCHOOLS.
- XXV BUILDING THE RAILROADS.
- XXVI RECONSTRUCTION.
- XXVIII AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.
- XXIX GREENBACKS AND GRANGERS.
- XXX MINING.
- XXXI STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM.
- XXXII THE TARIFF QUESTION.
- XXXIII THE INDIANA CITIES.
- XXXIV THE COLLEGES.
- XXXV COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT.
- XXXVI POPULISTS, SOCIALISTS AND PROGRESSIVES.
- XXXVII MILITARY HISTORY SINCE THE CIVIL WAR.
- XXXVIII LITERARY HISTORY.

"Prof. Logan Esarey, of Indiana University, has written the History of Indiana from its earliest exploration to 1918. No man in the middle west is better equipped to perform this splendid task for the Hoosier commonwealth."

L. N. HINES, *State Supt. Elect.*

PRICE PER SET, POSTPAID \$8.00. SINGLE VOLUME \$4.00

Sent on approval to libraries. Address
all communications to

LOGAN ESAREY,
Bloomington, Indiana.

